

METHODIST REVIEW

BIMONTHLY

Edited by **GEORGE ELLIOTT**

VOL. CVI, No. 2 }
WHOLE No. 590 }

MARCH—APRIL, 1923

{ FIFTH SERIES
{ VOL. XXXIX, No. 2

Bishops Lewis and Thoburn

Pragmatic Christianity

The Consciousness of Immortality

A Conceivable Atonement

Shakespeare the Man

Persons or Propositions: Which?

St. Patrick: Apostle of Ireland

(FULL CONTENTS INSIDE)

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN

NEW YORK: 150 Fifth Avenue

CINCINNATI: 420 Plum Street

Boston Pittsburgh Detroit Chicago Kansas City San Francisco Portland, Ore.

Subscription Price, Postage Included, \$2.50

Entered as second-class matter July 12, 1879, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103
"Act of October 3, 1917," Authorized July 5, 1918.

New and Valuable

DORAN BOOKS

BACK TO THE LONG GRASS. My Link With Livingstone.

Back over the long, weary, dangerous, fascinating trail of Livingstone we travel in company with the inimitable author of "Thinking Black." A vivid record of a thrilling accomplishment in honor of the great missionary. Fully Illustrated. 8vo. \$4.00.

Dan Crawford, Author of "Thinking Black."

CRITICAL HOURS IN THE PREACHER'S LIFE

Rev. Ernest C. Wareing, D.D., Litt. D. Editor of the Western Christian Advocate.
With striking originality and startling frankness this well-known editor and preacher reveals the struggles, tragedies and temptation of the minister's life. A book of warning and inspiration. Net, \$2.00

THE BEST I REMEMBER

Arthur Porritt, Editor of The Christian World.
An astonishingly interesting book of reminiscences covering thirty-three years of London religious journalism. Full of good stories and intimate glimpses of notable leaders in English non-Conformist circles. Net \$3.00

THE HEBREW PROPHET AND THE MODERN PREACHER. The Hartley Lecture on Preaching for 1922.

Rev. Henry J. Pickett, Ex-Principal and Principal Designate, Hartley College, Manchester.
A call for the prophetic ideal in the ministry today. The author says: "This book has been written under the pressure of a deep conviction that our supreme need is a truly prophetic ministry." Net, \$2.50

SOME LIVING MASTERS OF THE PULPIT

Rev. Joseph Fort Newton, D.D., Litt. D. Author of "Preaching in London," etc.
Dr. Newton's personal contacts and power of analysis makes this a volume of peculiar insight and richness of incident. Of deepest interest to ministers and laymen alike. A very fitting companion volume to William Robertson Nicoll's "Princes of the Church." Net \$2.00

NIGHT SCENES OF SCRIPTURE

Rev. Norman Macleod Cate, B.D. Author of "The Seven Deadly Sins," etc.
"Mr. Cate has not sacrificed direct, eager power to literary ambition. One feels through the pages the glow that has made him so effective a preacher."—Rev. Prof. James Moffatt, D.D., Litt. D. Net, \$1.25

THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS

Rev. Norman Macleod Cate, B.D., Author of "Night Scenes of Scripture," etc.
A series of brief sermons on the historic seven sins, notable for their literary allusiveness and simple power. Net \$1.00

CHURCH AND SUNDAY SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Rev. F. E. Burroughs, D. D., Architectural Secretary, Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention.
This complete manual by a well-known authority offers those who are responsible for the planning and building of churches just the needed help and advice. Its use will not only save greatly in cost, but assure much more usable and desirable buildings. Illustrated with many plans and designs. 8 vo. Net, \$2.50

THE MEN'S CLASS IN ACTION

F. Harcey Morse, Adult Division Superintendent, St. Louis County Sunday School Association.
A complete manual for adult class leaders. Supplies full and exact information on how to organize and conduct adult classes. Net, \$1.50

REGENERATION AND RECONSTRUCTION. A Call to the Church.

Rev. S. B. John. With a Foreword by Rev. John Clifford, D.D.
A powerful plea for Christian idealism and a clarion call to the Church to realize its mission in the present age. Every preacher in the land should come under its influence. Net, \$1.25

TEACHING ADOLESCENTS IN THE CHURCH SCHOOL. A Plan Book for Training Leaders of Youth Based on the Project Plan.

Erwin L. Shaver, Secretary for New England Congregational Educational Society.
"A genuinely new departure in the method that it unfolds for conducting a training class."—Professor George A. Cox. Net, \$1.25

OUR FAITH IN GOD THROUGH JESUS CHRIST. Its Reasonableness, Necessity, Effectiveness, and Finality.

J. Ernest Davey, M.A., B.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, General Assembly's College, Belfast.
One of the recent issues of the Student Christian Movement which will be very acceptable in Christian Student circles in America. A vigorous defense of the Christian position in the light of difficulties raised by the modern man. Net, \$1.75

ST. MARK'S LIFE OF JESUS

Theodore H. Robinson, M.A., D.D., University College, Cardiff. Foreword by Rev. Prof. James Moffatt, D.D., Litt. D.
Referring to this practical Student Christian Movement handbook, Dr. Moffatt says: "Dr. Robinson makes the life of Jesus more real, and so more wonderful than ever. Suitable for study circle or private reading." Net, \$1.75

THE MEANING OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: According to Modern Scholarship.

Hugh Martin, M.A., Literature Secretary, Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland.
Of this recent publication of the Student Christian Movement the United Methodist says: "It presents a constructive interpretation of the Old Testament that solves many a problem for the Bible student." Net, \$1.60

A BRIEF BIBLICAL HISTORY. Old Testament.

Rev. Prof. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D. Author of "The Biblical History of the Hebrews to the Christian Era," etc.
A compact, scholarly handbook on Old Testament History for classes in religious education. The author's name guarantees accuracy and highest scholarship. Net, \$2.00

A BRIEF BIBLICAL HISTORY. New Testament.

Rev. Prof. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., Author of "The Biblical History of the Hebrews to the Christian Era," etc., and B. T. Dean Smith, M.A., Vice-Principal of the Clergy Training School, Cambridge.
A compact, scholarly handbook on New Testament History for classes in religious education. The authors' names guarantee accuracy and highest scholarship. Net, \$2.00

CAPTAIN PLUCK. The Story of a Real Boy

Isla May Mullins, Author of "The Boy from Hollow Hut," etc.
A pre-eminent book of inspiration and fascination for boys—the book that parents and teachers are looking for to encourage boys in choosing a life work worth while. Net, \$1.50

LET'S PLAY. A Book of Games for Children

Edna Geister
Games and contests for little folks, at school or in the home; for large or small parties, indoor or out. A companion volume to Miss Geister's popular "Ice Breakers and the Ice Breaker Herself." (\$1.35), and "It Is to Laugh" (\$1.25). Net, \$1.25

At Your Religious Book Store

DORAN BOOKS

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY
Publishers in America for HODDER & STOUGHTON
244 Madison Avenue
New York

AN
KS

lack."
nimita-
sionary.
o. \$4.00.

THE

Train-

Pro-

England

it unfolds

Cor.

et. \$1.25

ESUS

essity,

essor of

Assen-

Movement

ehicles in

on in the

et. \$1.75

, D. D.,

word by

, Litt.D.

ent hand-

a life of

Suitable

et. \$1.75

ESTA-

rship.

Student

Ireland.

in More-

construc-

many a

et. \$1.50

d Tes-

on, D.D.

ry of the

ra," etc.

istory for

guarantees

et. \$2.00

Testa-

, Author

brews to

T. Dean

e Clergy

istory for

guarantee

et. \$2.00

al Boy

uthor of

'ut," etc.

or boys—

or to en-

et. \$1.50

ildren

Geister

or in the

A com-

akers and

to Laugh"

Net. \$1.25

ANY

v York



WILSON SEELEY LEWIS

METHODIST REVIEW

MARCH, 1923

BISHOP WILSON SEELEY LEWIS

EDWIN HOLT HUGHES

Malden, Mass.

ON the strictly personal side of his life Wilson Seeley Lewis is a somewhat hidden character. The thought about him since his passing makes even his closer friends aware of this strange fact. *Who's Who in America*, which someone has called "that excellent collection of autobiographies," reveals little about him. He evidently filled out the blank in sparest fashion, and there are less than nine lines of information! His is quite the shortest record in his own neighborhood in the book. It was much the same with the biographical record printed in the *Daily Christian Advocate* at the time he was elected bishop. Knowing him as I did, I can readily see the persistent representative of that organ "extracting" the information and securing only by journalistic, not to say hydraulic, pressure, the items that were deemed necessary. The outline of his career, as there given, is scanty.

Noting these facts his intimates say in a somewhat surprised way, "It was just so with his private conversations, and with his public addresses." He was not a self-revealer. We cannot recall when he ever discussed any question in a personal way. When he spoke, he himself was in the background, and his cause was in the foreground. The word "I" did not seem at home in his vocabulary; but Epworth, and Morningside, and China were there in shining letters. As I think of him, this fact more and more impresses me. In a glorious way, he was concealed by his enterprises. He never said so, but his record puts the phrase into his soul, "I must decrease; my cause must increase."

Here are the biographical items as I have gathered them in fragments from several sources:

Born July 17, 1857, on a farm near Russell, Saint Lawrence County, New York.

Son of William H. and Hannah (Turner) Lewis; Welsh on his father's side, Dutch on his mother's—a child of a fairly large family.

Passed his boyhood on the farm, working at his rural tasks.

Went to the public schools, and finally entered an academy at Canton, N. Y. Studied likewise for a time at Saint Lawrence University, a Universalist college at Canton. Received his Bachelor's degree at Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, in 1889, prior to which time he was for three years, 1882-1885, superintendent of schools at Belle Plaine, Iowa.

Joined the Upper Iowa Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1885. Pastor at Blairstown, Iowa, 1884-1887. In Europe 1887-1888. Principal of Epworth Seminary, Epworth, Iowa, 1888-1897. President of Morningside College, 1897-1908. Bishop Methodist Episcopal Church, 1908-1921. Went into God's nearer presence, August 24, 1921.

So runs the record. All along the days of its making some persons could give facts of interest; but concerning those facts the lips of Wilson Seeley Lewis are scarcely more sealed in death than they were in life. He was an immense advertiser of God's work, but not of God's worker! He always made his labor large enough so that he could stand in its shadow. He has sometimes reminded me of that artist—glorified by Drummond's description—who on a bitter night while his workmanship in clay was still damp and plastic, wrapped his own garments about the wondrous labor of his hands that it might not be broken by the fingers of ice, but was himself found at morn as a martyr by its side.

One says that he worked his way to and through college "with much sacrifice." I never heard him give a hint of that. One who was there says, truly of course, that he came to a spiritual crisis at a revival meeting while he was teaching at Belle Plaine, Iowa, in 1884, and that there the fountains of the great deep in his nature were opened, and that he offered up a prayer of such mighty

and prevailing passion that the school and the town were moved toward God. I never heard Bishop Lewis mention that experience. His friends have told me of the days and nights that he spent in prayer, and of how he scattered Jabbok experiences, longer than that of wrestling Jacob, by the streams of his own life. He himself never spoke to me of any of his lengthened seasons of waiting on God. Yet we sat side by side for thirteen years in every bishops' meeting held when he was in America; and we talked in closest confidence of the Lord's work! In deeper personal affairs he was a master of silence.

Yet there stands the record: Epworth Seminary, lifted from despair to hope, and taken from approaching death to larger life—and this in a period when the high schools were almost everywhere supplanting academies! It is no wonder that his work in that Iowa village made certain men believe that he might do something with another piece of educational hopelessness. In 1897 he was prevailed upon to accept the presidency of Morningside College, at Sioux City, Iowa. Chaplain McCabe, while he was at the American University, once said that he "was the Chancellor of a Dream." Morningside was scarcely a dream when Doctor Lewis gave it a place in his wakeful life; but because for eleven years it became his "dream," it became likewise an increasing reality in the service of a city, a State, a church.

Only one who has struggled with a college under severe limitations can at all appreciate what President Lewis accomplished at Morningside. When he came, its equipment was a vacancy, its endowment a deficit, its asset a mortgage, its scholastic standing and repute a doubtful prophecy! Beginning with one hundred students, he ended his work with five hundred. Beginning with property of negative value, he ended with over half a million. But this story of the outer life is not even a good symbol of what was accomplished more deeply. He gave the college a soul, a soul like unto his own. His life was built into its intellectual and spiritual foundations and walls. Few colleges in America answer so fully to that figure of speech which declares that "an institution is usually the lengthened shadow of some one man." Any person with open eyes and open heart cannot now spend a day at Morning-

side without meeting the spirit of President Lewis. The buildings are "haunted" by him, in the only sense worth while! I found long afterward that he saw in advance what the educational foundations later emphasized, namely, that a nearby city made a great field for a college. He went to Morningside partly because he believed in the strategic location of Sioux City as offering both an urban and a rural field for an institution. In truth this prophetic strain in him was always strong. He saw the day before it came to a calendar, because he saw clearly the inevitable working of certain tendencies that were almost laws.

Without question in the eleven years at Sioux City President Lewis did an amazing work. He caught the vision and he made it reality. Those who were near at hand knew that walls were rising all the time, but "the sound of the hammer" was not heard afar. Wilson Seeley Lewis came to the General Conference of 1908 a comparatively unknown man in the general church. His two pieces of educational statesmanship had given him much esteem in upper Iowa, while his Morningside work compelled the attention of the State. He had never before been a member of a General Conference. But his friends insisted that he should be considered for the episcopacy. They, headed by the late Senator J. P. Dolliver and O. P. Miller, and by Doctors J. B. Trimble and Robert Smylie, were assured and enthusiastic in their personal estimates, and they lifted him up to the view of the church. In those preelection discussions, which are inevitable and useful in so large a church as ours, it became evident that the name of Doctor Lewis would be found on many ballots.

He did nought at Baltimore to make himself better known. There was no quieter member of the body. He made no speeches; he did not even "move the previous question." Indeed, he rarely entered into public debates. In the bishops' meetings and in the General Committees his voice was not often heard. The most of his service was rendered in the silent but important backgrounds. His accomplishments never came like the rush of a torrent but rather like the sweep of the tide. The constituency of Morningside College found that under the administration of this serious and seemingly timid man, the institution was lifted and

lifted and lifted. The voting for him had that quality. The delegates studied the Iowa certificates of his service and their response came steadily. On the fifteenth ballot he was elected as bishop. The wisdom of that election stands to-day utterly unquestioned in the whole church.

But there came a time in the voting process when he himself was much bewildered. As ballot after ballot proceeded without result, he wondered if the hesitancy of the delegates did not represent a real doubt as to the divine will. Only the forceful insistence of his friends prevented the withdrawal of his name, and this when his vote had mounted well nigh to the two-thirds figure. Some will still remember the eager group that gathered about him and made him leave to the General Conference the decision, unaffected by his modest judgment of himself. They rendered the work of God a vast service on that day. Several big interests of Methodism would now be incalculably poorer if Wilson Seeley Lewis had not come into our episcopacy.

The secrets of this man's power may be measurably found at three points, though this arithmetical putting of the estimate would not exclude other items of personal strength. The effort now is to show his outstanding characteristics.

He was a man of *wisdom*. He had this quality, even in its superficial phase. He was not himself aware of his own remarkable shrewdness; and many who knew him slightly would never glimpse this faculty which was wholly hidden by his outward appearance. He was not a schemer, but he was an estimator! More than once his friends saw some man, "wise in his own conceits," depart from a conversation with the idea that Bishop Lewis did not understand! But they knew surely that behind the bland and innocent expression on his face there was an insight like a moral and intellectual X-Ray! His judgments of men were not often verbally expressed, but they were piercingly accurate.

The wisdom was far deeper than this. He read faces, but he likewise read events. He read men's minds, but he also read the world's movements. At Morningside he saw what the situation and the future called for; and to that he devoted himself. Whether in the selection of faculty members, or in the choosing of trustees,

or in the forms of appeal to the public, he was no blunderer! The college was put on foundations of wisdom.

It was just so with China. Perhaps it would not be easy to take the diagnoses of Chinese life and Chinese changes and separate in them the Bashford and the Lewis elements. But, great as Bishop Bashford was, Bishop Lewis was no mere understudy; neither was he an echo. His wonderful partner often confessed his debt to his colleague's quiet judgment, and went so far as to declare that sometimes he received positive "flashes of inspiration" from Bishop Lewis' conversation. His program for China was an educational one; and that program is being yearly justified. There is no part of the planet where the Saviour's figure of the yeast in the meal has more application than in that huge Oriental empire. The quick change from the Manchu monarchy to republicanism was speedy in its final issue, but it was not speedy in its causation. China is not to be won by a convulsion. Bishop Lewis saw that, and his plans were formed about that insight. Yet he was not so narrow as to be only an educator. He was an evangelist as well. At times he was such a fervent "exhorter" that he would bring back the atmosphere of the old-fashioned camp meeting! In one part of the work he was Pauline. He foresaw the part that the cities were to play in the program of God; and he greatly strengthened the work at the populous centers. There is no hazard in declaring that our Christian objectives in China will long remain as Bishop Lewis declared them, he being in this respect of far-sighted wisdom one of the prophets of the Lord.

He was a man of *patience*. It is not too much to say that he was a specialist in the best drudgeries! I have already intimated that he worked in the fine and big backgrounds. My first meeting with him illustrated this. We were to dedicate the church at Rockwell City, Iowa—I to preach and take the public part; he to have charge of the finances. He came to the town three days in advance; had interviews with many persons; met everywhere the assurance that not one half of the eleven thousand dollars needed could possibly be secured, and met it with a dogged courage; and on Sunday morning handed me names and amounts that showed that the debt was already raised—and more! Yet I had difficulty

in making the people understand that the private quest of President Lewis made the success possible. This dedication incident is significant because it was typical of his work. He dreaded a service that was showy or perfunctory. A response, on behalf of the bishops, to words of formal welcome, was for him an affliction. Yet he would take on himself a big task and work it out with a patience as big as the task itself.

Thus, while he was not a dress-parade character, he was an adept in making plans for a campaign and equally adept in holding the advance trenches. He was often tremendous in public address, but he was truly marvelous in his influence on groups of planners. Business men yielded to him, not so much because of his direct asking as because he made them see the wonder of the work. His achievement for Goucher College, in the million-dollar campaign that came prior to the million-dollar epoch, was like a financial miracle. Later he did similar immense things for the Centenary, and for the educational life of China. Let no one think that he went to the Orient jauntily. He remembered no youthful call to China, as did Bashford. In such an hour as he thought not, the Son of Man came to him with a summons. His usual patience was strained, and even vexed! He told me that he was passing through Gethsemane and he besought my prayers. His dear wife counseled him through that struggle; and the church owes her a debt!

Going to China by way of Golgotha Bishop Lewis found there "the joy that was set before him." Is China so vast that it breaks the bodies of the men who would carry its burdens? I know only that its twin apostles, Bashford and Lewis, stooped more and more as they stepped under the increasing load. China became with Wilson Seeley Lewis a glorious obsession. He would not willingly have left her for any place save Heaven! After he put his hand to the plow that was to make deep furrows in Oriental life and so to prepare for limitless harvests, he fulfilled the law of the Kingdom by never turning back. Several times when he would not play a bit because he was "busy," I jokingly called him Atlas! I will allow the nickname to take on seriousness. He really did stand beneath the burden of the biggest part of the world. He worked,

and worked, and worked again. He deserved the rest that God provides for his saints—for a season beneath the heavenly altar; but he would not be at home where there were no large tasks! He would quickly adjust himself to the services of the eternal kingdom. I find myself quite naturally calling to him over the border and saying:

And doubtless unto thee is given
A life that bears immortal fruit,
In such high offices as suit
The full-grown energies of Heaven.

He was a man of *prayer*. He illustrated that saying of George Adam Smith about the praying of Christ, that with the Master prayer was not the preparation for the battle, but rather the battle itself. This explains why Christ was agitated when he prayed, but calm when he worked. Personally I never knew Bishop Lewis to lift the curtain on his place of private prayer. It remained for many others to detect him in his worthy secrecy. Yet it is surely known that "he advanced on his knees." His family and his friends testify to those long periods of his devotion. He had anticipated great help from a big corporation, when the weight of Morningside was on his heart; and he had a right to his anticipation. But a trip to Chicago convinced him that the hope was not even slender. So he returned to the home of his dear lay friend, went to his room with the request that he be not called, walked the floor in an agony of thought and prayer, and emerged after more than thirty-six hours with the plan that made the future of Morningside. Only his elbows had touched the bed!

Some homes in our country and in China will always keep the sacred tradition of his family prayers. Here he became familiar with God, as a man with his friend, face to face. Here, too, he became familiar with God's children, particularizing them by their names and their needs. One eminent minister has told me that he could never forget the prayer that Bishop Lewis offered in his home, at a time when one of his episcopal colleagues was in peril from an operation. He named his comrade by an abbreviation; told the Heavenly Father how we could not spare him from the work of the Board; and besought the Physician of Heaven

to help those of earth. God answered that prayer, and the colleague still counsels and works with his brethren.

I sometimes think with regret that this prayer life, on its public side, did not get its full chance in an episcopacy that carried him rapidly over the earth. Prayer needs intimacy, with men and with God. In a way it is "pastoral" rather than episcopal. We find ourselves wishing that the reverent effect of Doctor Lewis' prayers at Morningside College could have been brought to the whole church. Students actually went to chapel, "just to hear the president pray." It was thought at one time that his chapel prayers should be taken down by shorthand! It is literally true that the persons appointed to do this became so absorbed in the throbbing prayers that poured from President Lewis' lips that they emerged from the service only to discover that they had forgotten their assignment! Those who are persuaded that the prayer life of our church is the fountain out of which its work life must come will not fail of the human illustration while Wilson Seeley Lewis is remembered.

These are my estimates of this great servant of God. We were "twins" in our election, being chosen into the episcopacy on the same ballot; and our personal address to each other always represented that kinship. In these recent months, since the wires bore me the word of his death, I have often thought of him as in heaven. He belongs nowhere else! In the delirium that preceded his death, his speech consisted, not of wild ravings, but of snatches of prayer. In the lucid times he told his friends that he wanted another journey to China; but God gave him instead a safe and abundant entrance into the upper and better Celestial Empire.

They tell me that when they laid Bishop Bashford's dust in that Delaware, Ohio, grave, Bishop Lewis stood after the people had mostly gone, and that he began to sing, quaveringly, "There's a land that is fairer than day." He was not a singer; but I know that in that sacred hour true melody would have been in his song. He was himself not far from that fair land; and the few who heard him sing his hope, made more touching by the homesickness he felt for his departed colleague, say that it was as if some of the harmony of the country into which Bashford had passed came to

dwell for a moment in his partner's voice. They buried Bishop Lewis' body ere long, clad in a scholar's cap and gown—emblem of his chief work on earth, and emblem, also, of the fact that he had gone into that school-room where he would learn lessons that were not lawful for him here.

I shall not be irreverent if I picture him there. If Celestial demeanor is like that of this country, his gaze would be thrust forward in that inquiring fashion that was his characteristic. Nor shall I withhold a peculiar contrast that has occurred in my thought of him. Milton represents Satan, ere the angel fell, as looking down upon the golden pavements with eyes of greed. But I think that Bishop Lewis would wonder whether he could not get some of the gold down to Morningside or China! I see him greeting his two episcopal classmates who had preceded him—Bishop Smith, who would instruct him in the laws of heaven; and Bishop McIntyre, whose last word on earth was "Lovely," and whose first word in heaven was doubtless the same, would open to him the beauties of jasper and pearl and the eternal light. I can also see Bishop Bashford's smile of welcome and his response with that sturdy quietude that concealed a deep cordiality.

The old theologians often spoke of "plenishing the kingdom of God," and sometimes they applied the phrase to heaven. The Revelator sees the nations bringing their "glory and honor" into the Eternal City. When Wilson Seeley Lewis entered its gates he carried an immense freight of that holy kind. Speaking most reverently, we may well say that he deserved a dwelling place like that described in the Apocalypse. Pearl gates, and jasper walls, and streets of gold are none too good for him. Heaven is God's idea of the casket for such a jewel, God's idea of the setting for the gem of such a soul. We may borrow the figure from Malachi and say that Bishop Lewis was one of God's own in the day, whether here or there, when the Lord of hosts made up his jewels.

Many of us who have known and loved him will ere long pass through the portals; and in the early list of the elect of our own hearts we shall greet Wilson Seeley Lewis as one of the Princes of the Everlasting Kingdom, reigning in the power of the Blessed Lord.

THOBURN—MYSTIC, SEER, PROPHET, MISSIONARY

WILLIAM F. OLDHAM

Buenos Aires, Argentina, South America

HE was of small stature, but great of soul. Frail he seemed and not capable of much physical resistance, but the burning heart within led him to undertake ceaseless labor and he was diligent to a degree. Unlike John Wesley, of whom Samuel Johnson complained that he never would sit down and cross his knees and talk, Bishop Thoburn was fond of conversation and often full of quips and jests. Frequently he would say, when he was being out-talked by anyone, "Now it's my turn," and always in later years his turn was cheerfully yielded him. It will be strange for his old friends to think of that active form and ready voice as stilled on earth. It is true that in these latest years the approach to the vast silence has been perceptible and rapid. But though we heard him not we knew he was there, waited on by hands skillful and loving, and we were content. Now, one who owes much to him cannot think of him but as with youth renewed, amid the great throng, alert, eager, comprehending, and bent on making his contribution to the activities and enlarging thought of that fair land whose shores he has long glimpsed and now treads. One cannot think of him and such as he merely lost in wonder or placid enjoyment. Something there must be to task his understanding and exercise his great soul if his cup of joy is to be full.

In Ohio he was born, that wonderful State where for so many decades the trained East met the adventurous West and produced that fine human amalgam which has given more than its fair quota of leadership to state and church. Methodism has received from Ohio many of her greatest souls, but, perhaps, never a greater than James Mills, the seventh child of Matthew and Jane Lyle Thoburn, who was born in Saint Clairsville, Ohio, March 7, 1836. So highly did he think of his native State that he would playfully say, "I am content in whatever State I am, particularly if it is the State of Ohio." He lost his father when a mere lad, but the mem-

ory of that godly class leader strengthened his heart through the years. But it was his mother, whose combination of rugged faith and a deep mysticism, bordering on superstition, that most profoundly affected the son's whole life. He went, a mere lad, to Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., when Doctor Barker was president. Allegheny College has always been an aggressively religious school, and he could not fail to be there confronted with the question of his personal relation to God. Brought up by praying parents whom he trusted, the religious ardor of his teachers and college mates found ready response in young Thoburn's heart. Under a powerful sermon by Prof. Calvin Kingsley, afterward a bishop, he was profoundly moved and went forward for prayers. Later, leaving college for a time to teach, and while trying to help some of his own students to a clearer knowledge of personal salvation, he himself came into the clear knowledge of conscious pardon and friendship with God. His own words are: "The light came, life became sweet, and the service of Christ was like daily food."

Returning to college, he graduated at the early age of twenty and soon after joined the Pittsburgh Conference. And then came a crisis. The young heart was troubled, the soul ill at ease. And a question presented itself, which in the way it was resolved gave tone and color to all the rest of life. His preaching often seemed to be in vain. No tangible results! Nothing happening! Was he really *called* to preach? He could not go on this way. The matter must be settled and definitely. "One afternoon I went out into the woods near the village and kneeling alone among the branches of a fallen maple tree, I talked the matter over with my Saviour; and there, alone with him, I received my clear and distinct mission to go and preach his gospel to dying men. I heard no words, but the commission could not have been more specific and clear had the visible Son of God said to me, 'Go preach my gospel.' From that hour I could preach with or without results." Here were commingled the vivid mysticism, the dogged fidelity, the strong common sense, which ever held in balance and made of James M. Thoburn at once the seer, the prophet, and the builder.

It was so at each turn of the road, always the straight honest

inquiry, the earnest prayer, the strange mystical subjective impression, with its following sensible program of hard and usually fruitful labor. His head seems often to have been in the clouds (or was it among the stars?), but his feet were firmly planted on the earth. This was again illustrated in the beginning of his missionary career. He had read years before a sermon by Doctor Olin of God's use of young men in the farthest extension of his kingdom, in the founding of Christian "empires." The word took hold on his imagination. To his latest years the word "empires" was frequently on his lips. Five years later the subject arose again and he grew restless, and in some vague way he felt that his work in Ohio was over. In prayer he again sought the divine guidance, *but*, and here is where his mystic brooding was always underlaid by sound common sense, *but* he would consult his presiding elder, Doctor Mitchell, Bishop Mitchell's father. "If he thought favorably of it I would take further steps, but if he disapproved of it I would pause and wait for more light, or, possibly, dismiss the subject altogether." At that moment his presiding elder was seeking him. They met. Said the elder, "I met Bishop Janes on the train this morning." "Bishop Janes! What can he be doing here?" "He is out looking for missionaries for India. He wants six, James; how would *you* like to go?" "I went upstairs to the little prophet chamber and knelt down to seek guidance from above. But I could not pray. God poured his spirit upon me from on high and my heart was so overfilled with a hallowed feeling of love and joy that I could not utter a word. It was not so much a call to India that I received. It was an acceptance for India." Nor did the impressions of that hallowed hour ever leave him. "That hour stands in my life as the burning bush must have stood in the memory of Moses." Once more, when in India itself, after all the early romance was over and the stark benumbing facts of India's intense devotion to her own idols filled him with anguish and as near to despondency as he ever came, seated in a lonely spot in the mountains of Gurhwal there came to him another of those supreme hours of his life when the positive knowledge of God's immediate presence was his.

He was reading in Isaiah 32 and when he came to the fifteenth

verse, "Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high," etc., an overwhelming sense of the divine presence came upon him. "The Holy Spirit was poured upon me and in a moment my sinking heart was filled with exultant hope and confidence." Nor did this vision ever fail. Years later he would refer to it with a holy joy, not as a memory but as an abiding experience. One cannot understand the ever expectant and ever victorious Thoburn without taking into account his vivid sense of the divine presence. There were high hours in his life but they remained as abiding experiences and demonstrated their reality and validity in the outcomes of his laborious life and fruitful ministry.

And this mystic quality of the seer peculiarly fitted him to understand India. Those light gray blue eyes of his often had in them a clairvoyant, far-away look of one who sees what is denied to mere men of earth. Such a look may be seen in the dark eyes of Gandhi and Sundar Singh and many another spiritually minded dreamer of India. With Thoburn this sense of the invisible was undergirded with a robust sense of the practical; and the emotional experiences of his soul put an edge of fire to the great and adventurous plans and programs he made and carried out.

The mystic seer was a Prophet. His was rare capacity for both foretelling and forthtelling. He glimpsed great things where others saw only obscurity. He penetrated to the heart of questions that baffled many an able contemporary. And when he told of what he saw it was always in the triumphant tones of one who saw not only the difficulties but the way through. His was both the prophetic insight and the clear limpid utterance of perfect assurance. It was God, he believed, who gave him to see, and it was God who would see his church win through. How could she fail? And the clear sanity of it all was constantly demonstrated in the outcomes. He was therefore ever an innovator. He saw beyond what the present held and the utter futility of present methods to achieve what he saw. He never hesitated to change the method to secure the larger end.

He cared nothing for "reform" as an end in itself. Any change he sought was always in methods that did not reach to make way for what would. This mystic dreamer therefore introduced

more fundamental changes in the structure and program of our Methodism than any man of his generation. Did he see that many of our humble lay workers, and, in that early day, many members of our Annual Conferences, got little practical help from the formal sessions of the Annual Conference? He would gather his group together at some other time and add certain instructive and inspirational features to the regular routine. Out of this was born the "District Conference," which is now a nation-wide training school for hundreds of humble workers in India and throughout the Far East. Were the low caste people moved by the gospel promises of enfranchisement to all the enslaved of earth, but were they utterly ignorant of anything more than a vague idea of escape from the inner wrong and outer burdens of life? He saw the beginnings of a great heart movement toward Him who cried, "Come unto me all ye who are weary and heavy laden," and he forthwith baptized groups of these and placed them under the teaching of those who knew but little, but knew enough to lead the groping multitude toward the dawn. Nor did it surprise him nor trouble him when the missionary traditionalist talked of "baptizing raw heathen." He was cutting them off from idolatrous customs and helping them "to follow the gleam." And he saw he was undermining that cruel caste pyramid of India by urging and helping its lowermost layers to step out into the sunlight and under the open sky of a recognized Father God. The God of Sabaoth was in the movement. He would enfranchise these oppressed. What was the railing of the traditional missionary as over against this vision now being ratified by events?

Again he saw that a male ministry availed nothing among the secluded women of India. What could reach was a woman ministry. But, but, the "buts" availed nothing. His sister Isabel quickly understood him and came to his help. Out of this came the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society. Immediately he saw the value of the deaconess. He tried to secure their ordination that they might exercise a fuller ministry among the shut-ins of India. It is laughable to recall that a General Conference sought to censure him for allowing the tips of his fingers to rest on the heads of some of them when being "consecrated." It might be

mistaken for ordination! And, now, to see that even this is coming!

When, tiring of the fitful administration of our foreign fields by meteor-like visits of "General Superintendents," he saw the value of "continuous intelligent supervision" called by whatever name, he boldly proposed the innovation of bishops resident in foreign lands. Seldom has an article so moved and startled the officials of the church as did his in the *METHODIST REVIEW* on this subject. And he prevailed. The result was the Missionary Episcopacy. And out of the Missionary Episcopacy has come the "area" system, which is on the whole giving us the most intelligent as well as "continuous" supervision we have ever had. And all this by the mystical dreamer who somehow glimpsed the outlines of continents where others saw but a fog bank. This was perhaps most notably the case in his seeing the value of the "Central Mission Conference" and bringing it to pass. Does it not hold the promise of relief from that centralization which would soon make a Methodist world organization impossible and give us both flexibility and solidarity, setting a wholesome nationalism in the matrix of a world internationalism?

In all this the great prophetic soul would say, God will work out the largest designs if we fearlessly step out with him. And somehow his dreams and visions are concreting themselves in ways that should bring something of confusion to those supposedly "safe" men who are ever in terror that the changing of the old order spells disaster. This man in all his career never fought a rear-guard action nor did he ever pick at existing things querulously. But when he saw some large advantage to be gained by changing ways, he went to work with fine practical sense and in simple and direct fashion he took his generation with him to higher heights and ampler horizons. In the realm of religious thought as well as in the mechanics of the church he was an independent. And his interpretation of the essentials of the Faith was as simple and clear as the light. It meant little to him whether a position were new or old. Essentially he was inclined to pragmatism. If some theory or doctrine did not seem to work, it was probably in need of emendation. And his spiritual passion was so intense that it

seemed to give him the deepest spiritual insight. And this it was that prevented much argument with him. Perhaps it is always so. The conservative minds of the church are readier to suspect new positions and interpretations when they are offered by men who, however scholarly, have never visibly made much spiritual impression nor commanded our religious confidence by their life and labors. But when this man spoke we knew what was behind the words, and there was therefore rare persuasiveness in them.

When theological storms were raging around Doctor Mitchell in Boston and later in Chicago preachers' meetings, certain articles by Thoburn in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, I think, commanded more respectful hearing than any.

The editor told this writer of his surprise that a voice from the outer rim of the Christian world should utter itself with such clearness and sanity as compelled wide and sympathetic hearing from the doughty combatants on both sides. Nor was he prophet only in seeing farther into the wide spaces. He had strangely compelling powers of utterance. It was not so much in his words alone but in the total outcomes of his presence and speech. A small dark-skinned man with trimmed beard and carefully dressed person, his clerical coat buttoned down the front, he stood before audiences great and small at home and abroad. Unimpassioned in manner, with rare gesture usually playing gently with his watch guard, not moving a step, speaking with clearness and precision in a voice that carried far, he reasoned of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come" in a way that never failed to interest and often to profoundly move his hearers. He was not what is called a "revivalist," but how men were drawn to God under the spell of his preaching!

They were people of all kinds and all stations in life. But particularly was his preaching powerful in winning the poor derelicts who are found in such numbers strewn along the coasts of Asia. He was so human, so free from patronizing the humblest, he saw so clearly the essential divinity in every man, and he was so certain of his Saviour's divine compassion and abounding mercy for all these broken ones. His voice would take on a note of almost maternal tenderness as he wooed them to the cross where one was

"set forth manifestly crucified" for them. Even when setting forth the darker possibilities that follow impenitence there was a heart break in his voice that had almost irresistible power.

Night after night in his Calcutta church he would call upon men to be reconciled to God, and night after night through the years men and women responded. The cry of the penitent and the voice of the returning prodigal were rarely if ever absent in those wonderful, simple, but always effective after meetings which always followed his night services. Sometimes it was a wandering young sailor, sometimes a woman of the street, sometimes a British merchant, sometimes an American tourist. And the genuineness of it all was seen and felt not only in the Capital City but all through India. Many of his hearers were English-speaking Hindus who were attracted to his preaching and his person. Said a stranger to a group of them one day as they passed out of the door, "Are you Christians?" "No," they replied, "we belong to Mister Thoburn." And he, democrat that he was, knew no difference among these various social layers that were in his audience. He turned from an English colonel or a Scotch lawyer to a sailor or a poor Indian clerk, saluting each in turn with kindly word and helpful suggestion. He really did not see any differences in them except in the degree that they needed him and his Lord.

On the platform or in the pulpit at home how the people flocked to hear him! He was so luminous in his explanation of missionary principles and so arresting in his illustrations. And all through his addresses there ran that bigness of conception, that certainty of large outcome, that invincible optimism which had its roots in his own deep abounding faith. No wonder the people were swept along the high tides of his assured expectancy and saw through his eyes the majestic progress of their Saviour's kingdom.

Will anyone that was there ever forget the amazing enthusiasm he aroused at the Boston Social Union banquet when, after some rather tame speaking, he arose, and in glowing terms, with that far-away look in his eyes, pictured the pitiable poverty of India's millions and their hopelessness but for Christ's utter sufficiency, and how that sufficiency was availing? And when he reached his closing words, "I expect to storm the gates of hell in

India with a million Methodists at my back," it was difficult to believe that it was staid Boston that grew so vociferously enthusiastic. I asked Bishop Merrill once, "Whom do you consider the greatest preacher in Methodism?" Immediately he replied, "Thoburn." "What makes you think that?" and he replied, "Well, what is preaching for, but to lift the hearers into the highest realms of thought and persuade them then to follow thought with action. Do you know any of us who can do that like Thoburn?"

No wonder Doctor Buckley, who disagreed with Bishop Thoburn more than any of the bishop's contemporaries, for the great editor was confirmedly conservative, said of him in that dramatic hour when the General Conference was moved to the depths in bidding farewell to Bishop Thoburn as an active worker: "There has never been a man like unto him in the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the purpose to which he devoted his life. With simplicity mingled with sagacity, with straightforward English, and yet at times, under inspiration reaching the spirit and words of the ancient prophets, but more frequently the apostle John, he has persuaded us when he could not convince, and convinced us when he could not persuade. Consequently he has had his way, which he believed was God's way."

Mystic, seer, prophet, builder, statesman, but above all and beyond all *Missionary*, James Mills Thoburn was one of God's great gifts to the church and the church served humanity at the highest by giving this, among the noblest of her sons, to great, fruitful, passionately loving-hearted India. His body may sleep somewhere in his native land, but his spirit, his memory, and the kindling inspiration of his great heart are India's and will be hers for evermore.

SOME RELATIONS BETWEEN CURRENT SECULAR AND RELIGIOUS THINKING

A LAYMAN'S ANALYSIS

I. THE NEW WORLD-OUTLOOK

THAT there are newer and older points of view in religious thinking is an evident fact. More or less heated diatribes from pulpit, convention platform, and religious press are constant reminders of the situation. Each partisan is inclined to deprecate the crass stupidity or the innate wickedness of his opponent, but one very fundamental and essential series of considerations seems largely to be overlooked: Just why have the newer views arisen and spread? Are there fundamental differences among those classified as sympathizing with the newer views, and if so what are the grounds of those differences? And how in general are the issues involved related to religion as distinguished from theories about religion and things associated with religion? A discriminating examination of these questions might tend materially to clear the atmosphere.

My thesis is that to a certain essential extent the newer attitudes in religious thinking are simply projections into the field of religious thought of tendencies that have transformed pretty much all other thinking in the last generation or two; that these transforming conceptions have a legitimate and necessary application to much that has been handed down to us as associated with our religious life; but that results obtained by the application of these conceptions to the complex field of religious thinking will be vitally affected by the religious experience and bias of the thinker—particularly that the results will be vitiated if he be blind to the facts of religious experience, which are a most essential element in any problem involving religion; finally that the negative results often associated with this application in large measure result from the fact that truly religious people, for reasons that we shall later consider, have so often left the task to the non-religious or even irreligious.

In the first place, let us think of the revolutionary changes that man's attitude toward the world and its phenomena has sustained in recent times. Great historical works were written prior to the last century, but the historical method and the historical spirit can hardly be said to have prevailed. In general each object or event was viewed by itself—phenomena were regarded in isolation. Now the productive thinkers of the world—those who are moving forward the frontiers of knowledge—regularly think of phenomena as forming related series. They have found that a most fruitful means of discovering what a particular thing is, is to inquire how it came to be, what combination of forces made it just what it is, what aspect of the object is an incidental survival from the past with only a historical significance, and what is the significant new element that determines the value of the later stage; or if the later stage be inferior to the earlier, the question is what element, earlier present, has been lost, or what new deleterious element has been added.

It is evident that this method recognizes that objects designated by a single name and commonly thought of as simple may be highly complex; and that their distinctive merit or demerit may not depend on the whole combination of elements, but on the presence or absence of some particular element or elements. The practical usefulness of such an understanding is obvious; it makes us complacent at the loss of the unessential, jealous at the loss of the essential, and intelligent in our efforts to enhance the essentially valuable and eliminate the essentially deleterious.

The whole subject of heredity and eugenics is relevant. What seems more unified than a human personality? Yet we know from observing ourselves as well as others that the human personality is a strange complex; often of apparently inconsistent characteristics. To one fairly well acquainted with the traits of his forebears self-inspection from the point of view of heredity may be interesting, sometimes amusing, sometimes saddening. Nor is the exercise useless, for as we find cropping up in ourselves an undesirable trait of an honored grandfather we are warned of a point where we need to station a sentinel; and when the sentinel fails to act, our understanding of the situation may keep us from

excessive self-condemnation. The same method applied to others may increase our charity. Of course, any gains from eugenics must be the result of this historical study of the human individual.

Examples almost without number from the titles of current books might be cited to show the vast range of subjects that are treated by the historic method. He who would understand the English constitution seeks the title "Development of the English Constitution." To understand a Greek temple front we need to see it as a development of log and beam construction. The various forms of the Gothic become intelligible to him who has traced them from the Romanesque or Norman. So with the whole range of the arts and with manifold institutions, political and social. Everywhere the investigator has learned to expect objects to be in chronologically related series and everywhere that very expectation has been rewarded by increased understanding or further discovery, until the method is applied by an almost unconscious habit of mind.

Closely connected with the historical method is the matter of historical perspective. The past grievously lacked this application of imagination. Our literature supplies examples at every turn. Chaucer, following the Italian Boccaccio, in *The Knight's Tale* took his theme from the prehistoric days of Greece, but the details practically all belong to the Middle Ages, with knights in armor and all the machinery of chivalry combined with just enough from pagan antiquity to keep alive for the modern reader the sense of incongruity. Similarly Shakespeare's Theseus is an English hunting squire who discusses his hounds while riding with his Amazonian bride to an English May-day celebration. It may be said that Chaucer and Shakespeare were artists rather than historians, and that the old stories were but hooks upon which to hang universal pictures of human life with details from the author's own time. Granting this, we only transfer the lack of historical perspective to the audience that would in this procedure see no incongruity.

A sense of historical perspective enables its possessor to view with a sympathetic imagination the deeds and writings of the past in their own surroundings—physical, mental, social, or moral—

as distinguished from the surroundings of the interpreter, and such sympathetic imagination is distinctly characteristic of the best thinking of this age.

But there is another relation in which things may stand besides that of links in the same chronological chain; they may belong to coördinate connected series. The recognition of the importance of looking for the light that a member of one series may cast upon a member of a coördinate related series leads to the second great instrument in recent thinking, the *comparative method*.

This method that has done so much to transform and fructify thought seems to have been first hit upon in connection with linguistic studies about a hundred years ago. When Europeans began the study of Sanskrit they were surprised to find in both root forms and inflections many surprising resemblances to the Latin and the Greek. An exhaustive comparison led to the conclusion that the three languages were sisters, descended from a common ancestor. Where the Latin and the Greek differed, the Sanskrit would resemble sometimes one and sometimes the other. More important was the fact that sometimes where the Latin and the Greek at first seemed to differ, the Sanskrit presented a third form evidently related to both the others, and thus revealing a relation between the Greek and the Latin forms that had not been suspected. Following these clues scholars built up the intricate science of Comparative Philology which established the relationships of a great group of languages, laid down the laws of linguistic growth and change, and shed floods of light upon the history of both the languages and the peoples who spoke them, light penetrating deep into the misty past far beyond the threshold of written records or even of tradition.

How extensively and how fruitfully this comparative method has been applied we all know. A glance at the catalogue of a modern library will show an imposing array of entries under "Comparative." The method is closely related and supplementary to the historical. Both assume and induce the same general conception of the world—not a static world of isolated phenomena, but a dynamic moving world of related and interrelated series.

The consciousness of such a world to those who once have been born into it is like an ever-present atmosphere, as unescapable as the air we breathe. To change the figure, it is as if one who has spent his life in a series of winding valleys should ascend to a height from which the whole region should be spread out like a map. He would gain a perspective that he would never lose.

Those most likely to be affected by the processes that we have considered are workers in certain historical, social, biological, philological, and literary sciences. The business man, the engineer, and perhaps the physicist and the chemist, of equal mentality may drift along thinking of the world in the old static, isolated fashion. Metaphysical and temperamental bias, and the tendency of some to carry over into the moral world the uniformities observed in the physical world are not at present under consideration. We simply notice that a large body of intellectual workers have come to see the world in a new light. In what direction and to what extent the newer outlook must affect their religious thinking will be our next question.

II. RELIGION AND RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

In asking how recent changes in world outlook affect religious thinking it may be fruitful to consider the relations of religion and religious thinking. Religion is one of the most intimate aspects of the life of the spirit. In dealing with what concerns "the abysmal depths of personality" and lays hold of the infinite, it is well to realize, as men too often do not, that we are in a domain where the language of strict definition is inapplicable. We can only suggest, not define. The medium of expression and the realities indicated are incommensurate. Keeping this proviso in mind, let us try to think what we mean by religion as an individual mind may come in contact with it. I have spoken of it as an aspect of the life of the spirit. Speaking from the point of view of the only spirit to whose experience I have direct access, I should say that it is an attitude of submission to a power above the individual. I do not deny that there may be a truly religious attitude toward collective humanity or toward an impersonal universe. But for the Christian the attitude is one of thought,

affection, and will toward that supreme holy and loving personality whom the Christian thinks of as the "God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Let us keep as close as possible to the concrete facts of experience. In the circle of the family, of friends, of the church there is presented to me the idea of this personality especially mediated by the character, life, and work of Jesus as recorded in the Scriptures with the interpretations and connotations elaborated in the experience of the Christian generations. I yield myself in free and joyous submission. The experiences accompanying and following this submission are such as are attributed to the influence of God the Holy Spirit working upon, with, and in my spirit. Experiences follow corresponding to what my predecessors have designated as communion with the Divine One. And so the life proceeds, the most real and precious of all life's aspects. It rests on faith—on the affirmations of my entire nature with complexes of confirmations which I cannot and care not to attempt to analyze. It involves my whole spiritual nature. I accept rationally this personality as the most reasonable ultimate ground of all being. I am stirred to joyous emotion and answering love as I contemplate His goodness and love. The doing of His righteous will I keep before me as the goal toward which my life strives. This is one type of Christian experience—the type that I shall have in mind in this discussion, while fully realizing the possibility of other types.

Thoughtful men throughout the ages have reflected upon the nature and grounds of the Christian experience and life, and upon the transcendent realities which they were assured lay behind that life. Each age, in accordance with its light and on the basis of its own world view, has tried to explain the religious life and bring its phenomena into relation with the rest of the world.

This process is to a certain extent necessary. The religious life cannot be left like a disembodied spirit. The individual Christian needs a certain body of thought to give his experience definiteness, an intellectual cruse to contain the precious ointment. There must be some religious terminology for the maintenance of Christian fellowship and for the expression of the devotional life. There must be some body of thought and terminology articulated to the

thought and terminology of contemporaries, if the Christian life is to be propagated—if a technique of evangelism is to be developed. A demand for an even more systematic body of thought arises from the necessity of defending the Christian faith against the objections of opponents—in a word, for apologetics. There is further the urge of the thinker's own intellectual life—the philosophical impulse to explain the whole round of phenomena and experience in accordance with consistent assumptions and principles.

In the formation and transmission of such systems of religious thinking, two limitations are too frequently overlooked: the inadequacy of our knowledge, our terminology, and our thought processes to deal with the transcendent values involved; and the uncertainty that the thought-form that is the most helpful and satisfying for one age will be equally so to another.

Investigators of concrete physical objects and forces realize that they are playing on the very fringes of knowledge; matter, force, gravity, space, time, motion, electricity, life—what are they? Terms that children use with feelings of entire confidence, upon the close scrutiny of the competent become like thin ghostly forms without substance or stability. What then shall we say of those august terms that aspire to lay hold of the spiritual, the infinite, the eternal? But these, it may be said, are matters of revelation. But revelation is through human agents and its truths must be in human language—in terms which for their content depend upon the experience of the recipients. Revelation is limited by the capacity of him to whom the revelation is made. The pint cup dips but a pint from the ocean. To the little child of the philosopher the terms in which his father thinks are meaningless, though by experience the child is assured of the being of his father, his presence, and his love.

But the theologian does not rest with testifying to the Christian's sense of communion with a Heavenly Father, nor does revelation rest here. We are confronted with terms that are intended to give us glimpses into the inconceivable depths of the divine nature and purposes, and the relations of the Divine One to the universe and to created spirits. It should be evident that

we are here in a realm that so far transcends human experience that terms can be used only symbolically and can convey a meaning only suggestively, the effectiveness of the suggestion depending upon the experience of the recipient and his sympathetic sensitiveness in the field concerned. In this respect the language of religion is like the language of the fine arts: for example, music and the higher forms of imaginative literature. Symbols, in themselves incommensurate with the transcendent realities, are so used as to suggest to sympathetic souls glimpses of those realities.

What has been said of the terms of theological thinking is even more true of propositions employing those terms. One stands aghast at the—shall we call it courage or presumption?—of those valiant old theologians who would use those tremendous symbols as pawns in the game of formal deductive logic, projecting their syllogistic bridges over the vast spaces of the infinities. Nothing seems a better foundation for logical reasoning than the axioms of mathematics, and yet proficient in the higher mathematics tell us that there are provinces on those higher levels where the axioms no longer apply. How much more reason is there to suspect that the vast realms of the spiritual can scarcely be triangulated by our poor human logic, where the very base-lines are determined by suggestive symbols. No, a great deal of the futility of much theological speculation, and a great deal of the difficulty with and objection to the Christian system, and much of the misunderstanding that hinders the church from adjusting itself to the intellectual idiom of to-day results from this application of the methods of mathematics and formal logic and the exact sciences to terms and propositions that ought never for a moment to have been thought of in such a connection—a failure to distinguish between the field of the sciences with its laws and facts and processes, and, on the other hand, the field of religion with its spiritual experiences and spiritual apprehension of ultimates.

A second limitation in the formation and transmission of systems of religious thinking is the failure on the part of many Christians to realize that the most helpful thought-garment for the faith of one age may not be equally available for another.

Our modern brides would hardly think they were properly

married without some form of the bridal veil. If we trace the custom back, we become involved in obscure questions of the social customs and religions of ancient pagan Rome. The wedding is so supreme an experience in the life of the bride that she cannot bear to think of omitting any practice in connection with the ceremony that has been hallowed by long custom. So strong was this feeling in connection with the bridal veil that its use was carried over from paganism by the early Roman Christians and is now found among twentieth century Protestants or unbelievers. This illustrates the common tendency to cling to whatever is associated even incidentally with the sacred experiences of life.

Now the religious experience may well be the most sacred and precious thing in life, and we have seen how natural, even inevitable, it is that a complex thought structure be built up around such experience. In this doctrinal structure are almost inextricably woven together the facts of religious experience and explanations of those facts in the terms of the general world conceptions, scientific, philosophical, social, political, and ethical, of those by whom and among whom the explanations were formulated. As this complex is handed down from generation to generation it comes to be regarded, especially by the unreflecting, as a homogeneous unit, hallowed by all the associations of the religious life, and perhaps regarded as essential to that life.

All may go smoothly so long as there is no radical change in the general conceptions of the community. When, however, such a change occurs, tension arises. This is first felt by those who are, from temperament or pursuit, most sensitive to current points of view, and who at the same time are most inclined to be consistent in their thinking. In matters even incidentally concerning religion, they are required to employ assumptions and methods which in other departments of their thinking they have repudiated as antiquated and unsound.

Different people are differently affected under these circumstances. Those with whom the intellectual element predominates may accept the assurances of the conservative that religion is inseparable from the discredited points of view, and, however reluctantly, turn from it as a beautiful dream of an age that is past.

Others, more deeply impressed with the reality and value of religion, are able to build around their religious thinking an effective dyke, impervious to the surrounding tides. Evangelical Protestants may more readily recognize this type among intelligent, devout Romanists than among themselves. A third and more significant class consists of those who, feeling a necessity for a greater degree of consistency in their thinking and being firmly convinced of the universal significance of the Christian message, are trying to discriminate between the essentials of that message and the intellectual wrappings with which it has become swathed in the course of the centuries.

Let us consider further the situation of this last class. The past two generations have probably witnessed more sweeping changes in the attitudes and methods of productive thinkers than had all the preceding centuries since the birth of Christ, the only rival epoch being the great break-up immediately following the middle ages. The man who is awake to the situation is absolutely unable to pick himself up by his intellectual boot-straps and set himself down on the other side of the chasm that yawns between him and the intellectual past. If he is to preserve his religion and, at the same time, some measure of thought consistency, he simply is forced to some such course as I have indicated above. The task is one of tremendous difficulty and complexity. Essential and incidental elements that have become almost fused together must be distinguished. New symbols in the current idiom must be formulated which will perform the function of the symbols slowly wrought out in the long homogeneous past. The essential Christian dynamic must be preserved, and to a certain extent a new evangelistic technique must be developed. Surely this is a task to be accomplished under the leadership of the same Divine Spirit who directed the whole process of revelation and has guided the church through its devious ways. And all this must be done in the face of the vehement opposition of those who, themselves feeling no necessity for the task, regard the whole movement a wanton attack upon things holy and precious.

There are really two great sources of misunderstanding between earnest Christian people to-day. The first has just been re-

ferred to—one group do and the other do not feel the necessity of readjustments in theological idiom. The second is quite as important. Those who do not feel the necessity of the newer method often fail to recognize the radical differences in purpose and results among those advocating newer points of view. Aristophanes as a conservative hated and feared the new educators of his time, but he put all new-fangled teachers into a single class, making no distinction between the disingenuous, self-seeking sophists and Socrates, perhaps the greatest moral teacher of the non-Christian world. Consequently in his wonderful play, "The Clouds," he made Socrates the mouthpiece of the most reprehensible teachings of the sophists, creating against the sage a prejudice that contributed directly to his later condemnation and execution. Earnest men are to-day making a similar confusion, making no distinction between those who would defend the faith by distinguishing it from certain discrediting integuments, and those who would discredit the faith by identifying it with those integuments.

Even where the scholar has no consciously hostile purpose toward the Christian faith and life, his results will be vitiated if he does not possess that spiritual experience that alone makes one competent to deal with spiritual values. As well might a blind man be a competent authority upon color or a deaf man upon music. Much of the impression that modern thinking is hostile to religion has resulted from the fact that the more devout have so largely left to the hostile or to the religiously incompetent those delicate tasks the primary requirements for which are spiritual sympathy and dependence on the Spirit of Truth.

Perhaps we may next, with profit, apply to certain important specific problems the principles so far presented.

(TO BE CONCLUDED IN THE NEXT ISSUE)

PRAGMATIC CHRISTIANITY

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

Detroit, Mich.

MR. PRESIDENT, FATHERS, AND BRETHREN:¹

THE angels of the churches have greatly increased in number since the brave days when the first chapters of the New Testament Apocalypse were written. They look out on far lying territories and they see the mobilization of the Christian forces in many lands. And since the days when sailors first moved through the Strait of Belle Isle and the days when daring explorers first passed beyond the Rockies and listened to the breakers of the Western Sea your own potential country has not only become a mighty commonwealth, a free empire in the New World, but it has also become a land of commanding Christian forces. The angels of its churches have looked upon numberless valiant deeds. They have witnessed the growth of Christian character and the impact of vast Christian energies upon the life of the whole land. It is saying the truth modestly to declare that Methodism has had its own commanding share in the Christian achievement in Canada and to-night it gives me great joy, speaking for four million Methodists across the invisible line which separates your great commonwealth from our own, to bring greetings all glowing with eager friendship, with pride in your achievement, and with glad expectation for your future.

It is a great happiness for me as a citizen of the United States of America to stand to-night in this great and free Dominion of the British commonwealth. The two peoples share the glory of a common Anglo-Saxon tradition and the hopes of a common ideal of democracy. Our dearest political traditions go back to that motherland of modern political freedom where the people wrought out the institutions of parliamentary democracy. We are not at

¹This address was delivered before the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Canada by Doctor Lynn Harold Hough, who was the fraternal delegate from the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States of America, on Friday evening, September 29th, 1922.

all willing to admit that our life begins with the year 1776. The very latest date which we are willing to accept as a mark of the beginning of our tradition is that great year we share with you—1215, when the Magna Charta was signed—and we have a shrewd suspicion that our beginning lies much farther back in the very roots of English civilization in the world. At all events the long struggle for parliamentary control in England is incorporated in our own tradition and the fountains of our liberty are the very fountains from which you drink. We have an intellectual tradition which we share in common. The bright and piercing eyes of Don Chaucer have quickened the observation of our young men, the imperial brain of Shakespeare in which every human type found a home has given us a new intellectual citizenship, the royal dignity of Milton's prose, and the long reverberating music of his stately verse have given us a new sense of the dignity of our good old English speech and the loftiness of the principles to which it can give noble and commanding expression. The chastity and restraint of Matthew Arnold, the haunting melodiousness of Tennyson's verse, the depth and range and grasp of the mind of Browning, the moral passion of Carlyle, the love of ethical beauty which burns in the writings of Ruskin: all this and much more is ours even as it is yours. The Anglo-Saxon heritage has made kings of us all.

It is also a great happiness for me to stand here to-night because we are all sharers in another gracious heritage. We have in common the American tradition. A few years ago a distinguished publicist of the Dominion of Canada delivered a series of lectures at a commanding American university on the theme *The American Idea*. I believe that he was right in asserting that out of our experiment of living in Canada and in the United States a certain spirit and a certain point of view have come into being which may indeed be described as the American Idea. And you and I receive that as a common inheritance. We do not forget—he did not forget—how much we owe even in things which we have come to regard as distinctly American to battles fought and to victories won while America was still hidden beyond the mystery of the tossing Atlantic. But it is not too much to say that our appli-

education of the principles of freedom and self-government have given to us a spirit and a mood about life which are all our own. We have our own problems and our own terribly significant struggles. We are tempted to be overconfident. We are likely to set all too small value upon those gracious urbanities which are the fruit of a ripe and mature civilization, we are tempted to value things more than we value ideals and property more than ideas, and to fall down and worship our own material prosperity. But for all that on this side of the sea there has come to be a new and wholesome sense of the value of every man just because he is a man, a new fearlessness and a new unhesitating directness of thought about many things where the smothering influence of ancient custom has made directness difficult. A new belief in the future has been born on this side of the sea. A new belief in humanity has grown up in Canada and the United States. In your great Dominion and in our republic humanity has tasted of a fountain which has made its spirit young again. And we share in this happy renaissance of the spirit of man. The American tradition has made optimists of us all.

There is another matter which is a source of deep gladness to me to-night. And that has to do with another heritage which we hold together. The Methodist tradition is our common treasure, our common responsibility, and our common hope. That urbane eighteenth century, with so polished a surface and so tragic a moral decay at the heart of it, saw the planting of the seeds of a new moral and spiritual life all over the English-speaking world. That precise little Oxford scholar "with a genius for government not inferior to that of Richelieu" found one England and left another. Religion was born anew as Mr. Wesley and his captains carried on their mighty advance in the name of a victorious experience of the Christian life. And Francis Asbury and all the other apostles of the saddlebags baptizing infant villages in the name of vital piety all over the lands which have become your Dominion and our Republic put new moral and spiritual fiber into the life of both lands. They changed a world of rude battling with the forces of nature in America and a world of polite cynicism in England into a world with the light of the Eternal shining in its eyes and the

passionate consciousness of the presence of God taking a new place of command in its conduct.

To be sure we gladly admit that we owe much to many a stately and noble ecclesiastical tradition. The haunting sense of solidarity has been put forever in the heart of Christendom by the Latin Church. The inspiration of a great belief in the humanity lifted into a finer meaning by the incarnation has moved in and out of the consciousness of many an age from the Greek Church of the first centuries. The Lutheran Church of the Reformation lifted the sense of the right of the individual spirit to a personal contact with the living God into a place of emphasis which can never be forgotten. The Reformed Churches have made memorable and commanding the emphasis upon the righteous will of God. And they have claimed the logical faculty as a bondservant of the kingdom of God. The Anglican tradition has brought a gracious loveliness into the expression of the religious life in many a land. The Independent tradition has stood for a noble intellectuality and for a stalwart freedom. And many of the movements of protest which we feel to have missed central meanings of the catholic faith have proven right in their assertions if they have been wrong in their denials. Gladly do we open our arms to hold the golden harvest of wisdom offered to us by the church universal. It is a great treasure. And we receive it with humble joy.

And even as we open our hearts to this spirit of catholic appreciation there comes a deep consciousness that our own characteristic experience of religion and our own type of life have a significance and involve a responsibility which we must not ignore. The Methodist experience and practice of religion has far-reaching implications for us and for that universal church from which we have received so much. If one desires a phrase in which to describe the contribution of Methodism to the Christian life of the world he may speak of the emphasis upon pragmatic Christianity. The mightiest sanction in Methodism is Christian experience. Everything else is seen in its light. Everything is appraised under its beneficent influence. From the time when John Wesley's heart was "strangely warmed" until to-day the pragmatic test has been the Methodist criterion.

May we ask ourselves then the question which has to do with the place of Pragmatic Christianity in the future of religion? In doing so we shall be also asking the question which has to do with the contribution of Methodism to the present and the future. I want to venture the assertion that there are some great human quests which can only be pursued successfully under the guidance of a pragmatic Christianity. And in following this claim I believe we may see the highways of most strategic service for our people in the testing days which lie before us.

I. The most significant of all the human ways of searching is the Quest for God. The story of man's strange adventure in the world is full of it. Every religion is poignant with the pain and passion and wistful hope of it. Men have sought for God in ritual. They have sought for him in acetic self-mutilation. They have sought to meet him in submission to the behests of a church. They have sought to find him in stern obedience to demanding codes. They have sought for him in ascetic self-mutilation. They have sought him in the majesty of nature and the exquisite beauty of art. And no earnest seeker, one dares to believe, has returned without some bit of gold. But there has been deep weariness. There has been sad disillusionment. And the way of permanent and triumphant security in fellowship with God has been missed by multitudes. It is not too much to say that that direct and mastering experience of the ethereal love of God in the soul of man upon which Methodism built its every sanction is the only path which offers full and growing satisfaction to the passionately hungry spirit of man. To be sure this experience has by no means been confined to Methodism but it has been the happiness of the Methodist people to put this experience in a place of unique emphasis and to keep it at the heart of their interpretation and experience of religion. The God whom one has met in a personal experience of the forgiveness and grace of Christ has much to say to the mind and active conscience and to the sense of beauty. But all this utterance is understood at last in the light of the glorious hour of meeting when God and the human spirit entered into personal fellowship. The way for us all in this difficult age is through that audience room of the spirit where we meet the Master of life

in the luminous glory of a personal deliverance. It is pragmatic Christianity which answers fully the passionate need which drives men to the quest for God.

II. The Quest for God is itself a part of another journey of searching which the human spirit can by no means avoid. That is the quest for certainty. The desire for something sure and stable in this changing world is one of the structural desires in human life. It emerges as a mental demand in the Eleatic philosophy centuries before the coming of Christ. It is a haunting desire back of much of the restlessness of this distraught and bewildered age. From Heraclitus to Bergson there have been thinkers who were prophets of the instability of things. But even they if they were to be saved from utter incoherency needed something permanent at the basis of all that was mutable. And even when most adventurous the mind of man is driven back to the desire for security in some abiding certainty which can be depended upon in the midst of all the flux of things. Men have tried to find certainty in an infallible church. And the church has become a tyrant of contradictory moods. They have tried to find certainty in a mechanically infallible book. But the Bible loses its soul the moment you attempt to turn it into a book of mathematical rules. They have tried to find certainty in their own natures. But the kaleidoscope within has offered no secure and steady place of rest. It is when the soul of man meets the life of God in all the wonder of a personal experience of religion that a basis of certainty is really found. There is no apologetic like the simple words: "Whereas I was blind now I see." The church has its contribution to make as it brings a man into the atmosphere of vital piety. The Bible becomes indeed God's messenger as it speaks not of mechanical rules but of the life of God in the soul of man. The voice of human nature itself responds when the mastery of the divine life has reached its deepest depths. But the deciding matter is just the mighty contact of the human personality with the divine life. It is a growing and deepening experience as the years go by. It is to be guided and developed by the play upon it of all the other lives renewed by the same experience. But it remains true that the central and defining matter in the finding of certainty is just

the meeting in vital experience of the upreach of man's need and the downreach of God's transforming love. Pragmatic Christianity brings satisfaction to man's quest for certainty.

III. In men who come to understanding of their own nature the quest for God and the quest for certainty comes sooner or later to be involved in the quest for an organic life. For the very disconcerting thing about the individual man is just his incapacity to organize all the forces of his life into noble unity and so to make possible a really harmonious character. Robert Louis Stevenson put it all too simply when he spoke of Doctor Jekyll and Mister Hyde. Life would not be so terribly difficult if there were only two of each of us. With more insight but with a curiously mixed bit of mathematics Matthew Arnold wrote:

Each strives nor knows for what he strives
And each half lives
A hundred different lives.

As a matter of fact there is a whole community of each of us. They have the most contradictory likes and dislikes. They want the strangest and most different sorts of things. Whole armies of them march and countermarch upon the arena of our inner life. And really that is too promising a figure. For a good deal of the time they are fighting each other in hopeless confusion. The battle for an organic life is the fundamental fight for every man. And the quest for a purpose noble enough, for a devotion great and high enough to master and bend about it all the forces of our life is one of the ultimate quests of the individual in the world. Here again the golden word is said by that type of religion whose appeal centers in a personal experience of the love of God as it speaks to us from the cross and as it grows in us through the fellowship of the living Christ. When a man puts the living Master in the place of selfish desire in his own heart the great decisive experience of life has come to him. Now he is ready for all sorts of large and far-reaching tasks. For only an organic life can work with the noblest efficiency about the great matters of the world. And here again a pragmatic Christianity has the message which is needed by our time.

IV. The Quest for an organic life on the part of the individual is not the end. It is only the beginning. It is inevitable that the man with the new life shall begin to think of the new brotherhood. It is inevitable that he shall enter upon the quest for an organic society. Men have sought for an organic society in a good many ways. Karl Marx thought it could be produced along economic lines and wrote *Das Capital* to make plain the way. Men have been ready to call in the most varied forces for the making of that better social order of which they have dreamed. One ventures to believe that no society can be better than the individual men who compose it. And therefore the individual whose own life has been made organic by the grace of God will always be the pivotal man in the making of the organic society. But there is more to be said. The very experience of the love of Christ which sets going the processes which make the individual life organic also sets in motion all the forces which make for brotherhood. The very experience which gives a man peace in his own soul makes him a brother of other men. And Christian experience itself is a social thing. It is not in isolation but in the gladness of brotherly living that men enter upon the great riches of Christian experience. And so it comes to pass that the personal appropriation of the love of God as it speaks to us through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is the very method by which an individual becomes a social man equipped to have his share in the producing of an organic society. Whenever your men of social passion are without this mighty personal dynamic they lack an essential part of the power they need for their task. And the man with a deep and rich personal experience of the love of God can only keep its shining clarity if he puts it to work upon social tasks. Social passion without mysticism is a body without a soul. And a deep and rich experience of the things of God in the soul without social expression is a ghost without a body wandering forlorn about the waste places of the earth. Pragmatic Christianity is to give wings to the social passion. And so at last the organic society is to be produced.

V. All the while the men who are most deeply responsive to the great moral and spiritual appeals of life will be haunted by a great desire. And this desire will set them upon another way of

searching. It will lead to the quest for a living church. It is easy to manufacture ecclesiastical machinery. It is not easy to be sure that the presence of the living creature is in the wheels. There are no end of things we should like for the church. The one essential is that it shall be alive with the life of God. All the augustness of its tradition and all the noble beauty of its form of worship will count for little if the breath of life is not in it. And here again there is one secret of potency. Some have thought to find it in the union of existing communions. And no doubt any union which is the expression of noble moral purpose and of great spiritual passion will have great significance. But mere union does not mean new power. The union of two dead churches would only mean the presence of a larger ecclesiastical corpse. The great matter is the securing of life. And when you have the presence of the very life of Christ in the soul of the church you will have the heart of unity even when there is no ecclesiastical bond. You can never secure life by even the most noble kinds of ecclesiastical manipulation. The life which is to renew the body of Christ must come from a new and deep appropriation of all that he offers to the soul of man. Once more the fountains of the living presence must play in the heart of every Christian. And this inner inspiration must be given adequate expression in relation to all the concrete problems which we face. Where there is a group of living Christians accepting the tasks God sets before them there is always the living church. And so pragmatic Christianity, facing with candor and passion the tasks of the actual world of to-day, will show us the way to the living church. And as we follow the guidance of the corporate life of the spirit we shall find a new unity coming to the church of Christ throughout the world.

VI. It is inevitable that every area of life shall at last be claimed for the rule of the living Christ. And so sooner or later the body of Christians in the world must set out upon the quest for ethical beauty. All that is lovely belongs at last to the church of God. The quest of loveliness is a really Christian quest. Indeed it is only as it is guided by the spirit of Christ that the quest for beauty is saved from grave and fearful dangers. The study of the renaissance in Italy reminds us vividly enough how poisonous

a thing the love of beauty may become if it is not mastered by the passion for noble and pure living. It is only when beauty is wedded to goodness that it is safe. And it is only when goodness is wedded to beauty that it is saved completely from a certain hard angularity which sometimes characterizes the expression of the best of motives. All the rich and glowing meaning of this wonderful world is to be captured and interpreted in the terms of that moral and spiritual loveliness which is at the very heart of the Christian religion. And here again it is a personal vision of the majestic presence of the living Christ which is to be the guide to all beauty even as it is the way to all goodness. Pragmatic Christianity is to lift the whole realm of aesthetics into the glory of the kingdom of God.

VII. There is another quest which has appeared before the mind of our age as a matter of great desire. We saw the golden gleams for a moment. We thought we were ready to set out upon the great adventure. But now clouds and darkness seem to be all about. Yet the quest must be undertaken. If we were confused for a moment we must arise with refreshed understanding and renew the struggle. We cannot forego the quest for an organic world. International relations must come to be dominated by the mind of Christ, or, to paraphrase a phrase I once heard Lord Robert Cecil use in the House of Commons, "We must go back to the politics of the jungle." If we attempt to exclude any set of relationships from the rule of Christ that very evasion will make it impossible for him to rule completely in any set of relationships among men. So by a necessity which inheres in the very nature of the Christian religion we must hope and pray and work for an organic world. And here again at last the whole matter rests upon multiplying the number of men and women with a living experience of the things of God ready to think the thoughts of Christ after him and to do his will in all the avenues of the life of the world. A genuine Christian experience makes inevitable the missionary enterprise. And just as surely it makes inevitable the ultimate battle of mankind, the battle for the enthroning of Christ in the whole field of international relationships. We are left dizzy by the magnitude of the task. All the more we are driven back to those

sources of inspiration which come from the personal fellowship of the Christian with his Lord. A Christian experience perpetually alive is the inspiration which will carry men to the end of the great endeavor. Pragmatic Christianity is to give us the capacity to create an organic world.

If all these things are true we may say very humbly and with a profound sense of responsibility that the very history and character of Methodism gives it a place of strategy in all the essential matters which confront the world to-day. Without self-consciousness and with devout gladness for all the great words to be uttered by all the churches we may know that God has given us a living word for this great hour. The emphasis upon Christian experience sets all the fountains of vitality playing in the church and in the world. Pragmatic Christianity belongs to all the churches. And it is to be theirs and ours all the more completely because we take most seriously our responsibility in respect of its dissemination. So with good heart we may go forth to do our work in the world.

A CONCEIVABLE ATONEMENT

R. E. FAIRBAIRN

Saint John's, Newfoundland

WHEN I was a small boy I was occasionally troubled by a peculiar form of nightmare. I would wake up with a horrible sensation, half physical, half mental, that speedily became unendurable. It seemed as though my head was filled with an immense number of infinitely minute bodies which were at the same time each as big as the earth. Apparently I had intuitively anticipated the modern conception of the atom as at once the ultimate unit of matter and as a universe in itself. It was the feeling of impossible reality, of contradictories embodied in reality, that I found so distressing. Now, without straining after any exaggerated comparison, I have to say that I have experienced something of the same kind of distress in the effort to grasp some of the modern theories of Atonement. I am one of those perhaps to be pitied persons who must have, as a working basis of religion, conceptions which have the feel of reality. The need for a preachable theory of Atonement is a mere platitude. I want something better than that. I want a *conceivable* Atonement. That there may be a "preachable" formula without any conception having the value of reality behind it I know full well. My special friend in theological college had a record as a successful evangelist before entering the ministry. In an intimate talk one day he confessed a problem that was bothering him. "It is not that I have ceased to believe in the Atonement," he said, "or that I doubt anything of which I was once sure. It is just that I have discovered that when I preached about the Cross of Christ and salvation through his blood, I was using with great confidence expressions that simply did not mean anything real to myself. What could they have meant to my hearers, and how could they have been converted by a preaching so out of touch with reality?"

As a minister I do need a preachable doctrine if I am to build an intelligent faith in my people; but more urgently do I

need a personal grasp of the reality of Atonement, which alone can justify my preaching at all. Quite early in my religious life I had rebelled against the crude substitutionary theory. Soon after becoming a "fully accredited local preacher" in the old country I had taken up the question with my superintendent minister in a rather rash way, I am afraid. The immediate cause of my outbreak was a verse in a hymn of Charles Wesley, beginning, "O wondrous power of faithful prayer," of which the second verse ran as follows:

Let me alone that all my wrath
May rise the wicked to consume!
While justice hears thy praying faith
It cannot seal the sinner's doom.
My Son is in my servant's prayer,
And Jesus forces me to spare.

The dear old "Super" with dignity and firmness took the ground that the church standards required me to believe in an Atonement involving a penal substitution. I could not bring myself to affirm this, and matters were drifting to a crisis when the younger minister came to me. He spoke about the modern tendency within quite orthodox circles toward a modification of the extreme form of doctrine to which I objected; he suggested that the presence of such hymns was one reason why a new handbook was being prepared, and he lent me Rev. J. Scott Lidgett's *Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*. I found a sentence in this work which seemed as if it might offer a compromise formula, and I took it to the superintendent and said, "Now I can accept that if it is satisfactory to you." He beamed upon me with delighted relief. The crisis passed and left me still within the fold. Later on, I came to see that the particular sentence served as ground of compromise just because it had no positive content at all. It was, what so many expressions of the mediating theories are, ingenious attempts to affirm and repudiate the same thing in the same breath.

Now I know well enough that a statement like that is either a piece of uncouth impertinence, or it is something of a discovery. Consideration and observation through the years, with the coincident judgment of some theological experts, have convinced me

that it is a fact. During my college course I came to see that whereas a straight and strict theory of penal satisfaction on the one hand, or a purely dynamic theory on the other, could each be formulated with perfect clearness, any mediating position manifested this curious quality, that apparently it could not be expressed. It could be hinted at; one could go around it and around it in involved sentences; but it seemed to be impossible to explicate it. I was even so rash as to state this opinion at length in examination papers. The heavens did not fall; but, as I since learned, my tutors' attention was drawn in a faint mixture of amusement at my callow theological excursions and alarums, with misgivings as to my future.

Some time ago there appeared in an influential English newspaper an article by the Rev. George Jackson, in which he complained about the absence from the modern pulpit of any definite preaching of the Cross. This was commented upon with strong approval by the editor of the *British Weekly*, who took occasion to define the preaching of the Cross as the doctrine that the death of Christ had for its primary purpose to enable God to forgive our sins. I am not quoting exactly, but I am sure of the sense, namely, that the Cross had to do with God first, and with man only as a result of its effect upon God, and that this effect was to make pardon possible.

Now that was a good statement of what I mean by the mediating theories. They all take pains to repudiate the harshest form of the penal substitution idea, while at the same time they insist that the Godward aspect of the Cross is primary, and that it made forgiveness possible. But when they attempt to say how the death of Christ affected God, or made possible what was otherwise impossible, they all without exception exhibit this phenomenon of incomprehensibility. They hint and suggest with paradox and antithesis, in metaphysical flight and poetic trope, but they completely fail to state with conceivable explicitness. Some attempts are even painful exhibitions, creating in the reader's mind a kind of vicarious embarrassment. They remind me of a sentence in a textbook of logic to the effect that some fallacies may pass for truth when spread out through several volumes, which when stated in

a sentence become obvious. I recognize every writer's privilege to the definition of his own terms and construction of his own thesis; what I am complaining about is that so many authors, after they have defined their terms and built their argument, when they gather themselves together to make a supreme effort and state their case with succinctness and precision, only succeed in demonstrating that there is no point in their case, but only a whirling nebulosity. The more thoroughgoing the treatment the more evident it becomes that they are attempting the difficult task of saying and denying, affirming and repudiating, the same thing in the same sentence. Their distinctions are not distinctions, but only labored ways of referring to a thing without naming it, of pointing out something while turning away the head from it. In picking out examples of this I acknowledge the risk of doing an injustice to a writer by taking a sentence out of its context, of separating a conclusion from its argument. I do not quote, however, as argument, but only as example, and to indicate an atmosphere. Let anyone follow up and read up each quotation, give each writer the opportunity to make good his own case, and I am satisfied that the average intelligent reader will confirm my charge of inherent indefiniteness.

Now is not this a remarkable thing, that so many acute minds should labor a position without being able to make it intelligible? Does it not suggest that something is wrong with the position? Is it not likely that G. B. Stevens is right when he says, "We may well suspect that what is required is, not better advocates, but a better case"? Surely we are justified in thinking that if these mediating theories could be "mediated" to the average mind, some of the well-known writers on the subject ought to have been able to do it. It seems to me that they do not, and I suggest that they do not because they cannot. I suggest that these mediating theories are not explicated for the reason that they are essentially inexpressible. I further suggest that what is inexpressible is so because it is not capable of being clearly conceived. And I assert that what is inherently inconceivable is probably not true.

The situation amounts to this. The exponents of mediating theories with one accord repudiate the revolting crudity of a strict

penal substitutionary doctrine. God, they say, did not punish Christ; his sufferings were not a judicial equivalent for the due punishment of all the sins of all the men of all the ages. No, no! Nothing like that. Nevertheless there was something in God requiring satisfaction so very like a demand for the legal *quid pro quo* that it may be described in terms that really mean that, provided they do not say so with coarse directness. There existed a barrier in God himself, apart from the barrier of man's unwillingness for reconciliation, which it was the supreme purpose of Christ to remove by his death. Isaiah was not quite theologically correct when he said, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." In the poetry of exalted devotion it may be permissible, but it is none the less dangerous doctrine to suggest, as the Psalmist does, that "He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities." Repentance, the sick and hungry desire on the part of sinful men for pardon, cleansing and restoration to God, is very necessary in its place, but beyond that there is something mystical, serious, and terrible in the very nature of God that must be satisfied before that "pardon abundant" can run forth to meet the returning sinner with the kiss and the glad embrace. And here at this point I notice something very strange in the ratiocination of nearly all writers of this school. With unquestionable sincerity, they appear to make use of what seems on the face of it to be a particularly unfair rhetorical trick. They envisage the case of a repentant sinner; they ask, "Can God grant forgiveness without a satisfaction for sin?" and they answer, "No!" "God is all-holy; how can he look with any kind of allowance or tolerance upon sin?" And lo! they have deftly substituted for the penitent sinner the image of a sinner satisfied and defiant in his sin! "How can God make terms with a sinner in his sin?" they ask, with this latter type in mind. "Therefore," they conclude, resubstituting the penitent for the defiant, "forgiveness is not conceivable upon a mere repentance, apart from some 'reparation to law,' 'satisfaction to holiness,' 'vindication of righteousness,' or whatever formula is favored. It is so obvious an

instance of the fallacy of the Fourth Term that one cannot understand how able men can use it without recognizing it. But they do. The sinner repentant, already potentially separated from his sin in thought and desire, though he lie still helpless in bondage to sinful habit, is not, it should be insisted, in the same case before almighty justice as the blatant and defiant lover of iniquity. Not to distinguish here is to invite confusion. With due respect I suggest that this is one reason why some writers of acumen and learning here flounder in a bog of nebulosity.

Dr. P. T. Forsyth was one for whom "dark sayings" seemed to have a fatal fascination. Apparently he was only really happy when discharging violent antitheses at the rate of one to each line of print. He is perhaps an exaggerated example of the kind of thing against which I am protesting.

"God did not punish Christ, but Christ entered the dark shadow of God's penalty on sin."

"That holy confession in act of the injured holiness, amid the conditions of sin and judgment, was the satisfaction He made to God."

"He had to bear the wrath, the judgment, the privation of God."

"Christ could not show the power of forgiving love in full, unless he felt the weight of God's wrath in full."

"I have sought to construe the satisfaction to a holy God as consisting only in a counterpart and equal holiness rendered under the conditions of sin and judgment."

At the same time he seems to harbor a barely confessed suspicion of the validity of these statements as argument. "No one can feel more than I do that if all this be not absolute truth it is sheer nonsense. So it sifts men."⁶ We would be in hopeless plight if truth, absolute or just ordinary, were no more capable of being conceived and uttered than the mind-wrecking anomalies and contradictions just quoted.

This kind of thing is by no means confined to writers of the Chestertonian mentality, however. Dr. D. W. Forrest glows steadily where Forsyth sputters. He puts it thus. "God's condemnation of sin, which fell upon Christ on the Cross, consisted in this, that he died a death which was not his own, and which yet in a

¹*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind*, p. 361. ²*Ibid.*, p. 362. ³*Ibid.*, p. 362. ⁴*Ibid.*, p. 364. ⁵*Ibid.*, p. 368. ⁶*Ibid.*, p. 365.

sense he made his own by his voluntary identification of himself with sinners, so that . . . he suffered as their representative the penalty of God's displeasure at human sin, and acknowledged it to be just."⁷

Dr. J. Scott Lidgett, while resisting the penal satisfaction idea, asserts an objective propitiation of God. Christ submitted himself to "the manifestation of the wrath of God against sin."⁸ Death came to him "charged with the utmost power to express both the wrath of God against sin, and the undoing brought about by sin."⁹ Christ "tasted to the full of those penal conditions which reveal the wrath of God against sin."¹⁰

Prof. J. A. Faulkner writes:

I admit there have been mechanical and overwrought theories brought in to explain the reconciliation wrought by Christ. . . . But for all that, atonement is atonement. . . . It is not only the reaching down of God to save; it is the self-propitiation of a righteous God so that he can save and—if I might so say—maintain his self-respect."¹¹ "The newer thought rightly excludes from it (the death of Christ) God's punishment in the proper sense, or, of course, the sense of guilt." "But Christ experienced the hatred of the world, the sentence of the law, and the evil that threatened humanity on account of sin."¹² "The atonement is God's way of loving and forgiving and saving without—if I might so say—losing his self-respect. It is the price which justice pays to love, or love pays to justice . . . so that salvation may come to sinners."¹³

These are but samples, yet I think admittedly representative samples, of expressions used in these mediating theories. They are not merely preparatory and provocative hints indicating a line of thought to be fully explicated later, but rather the supreme efforts of qualified thinkers to state with force and precision their ultimate convictions. Provided one can take words as mere counters, as pieces in a game, it may be possible to derive some measure of satisfaction from them. But as soon as one becomes dissatisfied with opaque phrases, and endeavors to look through them for whatever realities lie behind, then their whirling confusion becomes evident. There is a point at which one's respect for sincere thinkers breaks down beneath the load of extravagant paradox,

⁷*The Christ of History and of Experience*, p. 238.

⁸*The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*, p. 272. ⁹*Ibid.*, p. 269. ¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 274.

¹¹*Modernism and the Christian Faith*, p. 226. ¹²*Ibid.*, p. 100. ¹³*Ibid.*, p. 154.

multiplied antitheses, dark sayings, and general pious mysteriousness, which prove themselves entirely unable to proceed farther and reach a position of mental tangibility.

I personally am confirmed in my distrust of all these mediating theories by the obvious fact that they are incapable of clear expression. They do not call for contra-argument. Time enough for that when they are stated intelligibly. "Desert the strict penal equivalence theory of atonement," says Stevens,¹⁴ "and you logically end in the moral theory." Well, that would seem to indicate the direction of inevitable movement; and yet no "moral" theory I have seen so far appears to do justice to the grandeur of the historical deed of Christ, or to the actual situation involved in a human personality being saved from sin into fellowship with God. The moral view shows a certain tone and style as of a piece of Emersonian philosophy; but it seems thin and weak, lacking in both human nature and divine grace. Horace Bushnell's *Vicarious Sacrifice*, at least the first part of it, is to my mind still the most vital setting forth of redemption. (By the way, who was originally responsible for the surprising ineptitude of labeling that the "Sympathetic Theory"? It is a pure dynamic theory. Christ's sacrifice is, to this writer, the culmination of his work, whereby he becomes the "power of God unto salvation.") But this point of view certainly needs reissuing in the language of to-day, and in view of our modern emphases of historical reality and biblical criticism.

I have found most satisfaction for myself in following up a remark of W. N. Clarke, in his *Outlines of Christian Theology*, when, speaking of the reality underlying all attempts to define atonement, he says, "If we could find it we might be surprised at its simplicity; we certainly should wonder at its divine beauty and naturalness." I have tried to stand back so as to get the perspective, to disentangle myself from the technical vocabulary that has grown up round the subject, and to look afresh for myself at the facts of which any theory of redemption must be simply the explanation.

There are two considerations which seem to me to call for

¹⁴*The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, p. 432.

recognition in a frank and thorough way if we are to have a conception of atonement with the feel of reality. The first is this: seeing that all the historical theories from Anselm down have been attempts of men to state the fact of redemption in the thoughts and terms of their own age, we must make up our minds that the New Testament writers were simply the pioneers in the age-long task; that is, they were interpreting redemption in the idiom of a given age, rather than making a standard doctrine to be handed down through all the Christian centuries. This does not merit the charge of "talking down to," or "checking up" Paul, or the other writers. It simply means that we rightly evaluate their work, and do not suppose it to be what it could not possibly be. If their work had been sufficient for all time it could not have met the immediate need. That it had to meet an immediate need rendered it impossible that it could serve for all time. The theories, or suggestions of theories of atonement in the New Testament, help us to understand how the particular writers conceived redemption; they do not really help us very much to understand redemption itself. Those great minds were occupied with the endeavor to present the truth of Christian salvation to men whose thinking was bound up with systems of Hebrew sacrifice, Roman law, mystery religions, and the general paraphernalia of the thought world of the first century. Most of all they were concerned with Hebrew ritual in the developed system of that religion. Christian thought through the ages has naturally tended to translate the doctrine through the same medium. But it has been seriously handicapped in using that medium by the absence of the critical method and of the recognition of development in Hebrew conception and usage. We have only just come to realize that the Hebrew system was by no means given complete to Moses, but was of long and slow growth. We have hardly yet adjusted our minds to the import of the prophetic attitude toward sacrifice as having no special divine sanction. Whatever help we may get from the Old Testament sacrificial ideas and practices in understanding the mind of the early Christian writers, we are no longer bound, in fact we have no longer the right to regard those conceptions as determinative for our own thinking.

Nor are we under any necessity to suppose that every turn of argument used by Paul or the writer of Hebrews is theologically sound by the guaranty of divine inspiration. Paul not seldom permits himself to use as argument what we can only excuse as an *argumentum ad hominem*. Let anyone sit down and seriously consider a passage like Rom. 11. 30-32, or 9. 18-20, and he cannot but be convinced of this, especially if he read them in Moffatt's version. Can any twentieth-century man feel these passages to be other than shocking? The Wesleyan Church in England issues lists of books which it recommends to its ministerial probationers. Some of these are marked with an asterisk. A footnote explains that these are to be read "with discrimination." Would it really be honoring Paul or the other New Testament writers to require that we shall read them without discrimination? The highest honor we can pay to these pioneer Christian thinkers is surely to strive by the grace of God to do for ourselves and our generation what they did for their own time, namely, see afresh and utter in words of reality the significance of the Cross of Christ.

There is another thing which is, I think, apparent as soon as it is pointed out, but which needs pointing out, and when it is pointed out must inevitably be basic for any adequate modern presentation of Atonement. It is this: God in Christ is not operating any scheme of self-propitiation, or striking a balance between his attributes, manipulating a plan, or saving his self-respect. He is not making concessions to, or squaring Law; he is not even dealing with Sin in the abstract, or with sins in the concrete. He is dealing directly, as a Person, in a personal way, with persons. I believe that the way to an apprehension of the redemption of Christ for our generation lies through that thought. I invite careful consideration of it. God, as a Person, is dealing directly with persons. Atonement is no scheme having a direct effect upon God and a reflex influence upon men. It is neither a substitution, a representation, or a manifestation. It is direct action, and it is the direct action of a Person upon persons.

For me this opens out a conception of the purpose of God and the work of Christ grand enough and real enough to correspond with the greatness of human need and the marvel of God's redeem-

ing act in the historic Jesus. It may not appeal to others any more satisfactory than the mediating theories appear to me. But "so it sifts men"! I offer it at least for consideration to those who, like myself, reach toward those forms of doctrine and find nothing there to grasp.

The situation with which divine redemption has to deal is essentially simple, in spite of all efforts to complicate it with conflicts between law and love hindering God's free forgiveness of penitents. Through the ages God has been seeking to bring men into vital union with himself, as finite persons capable of fellowship with the Infinite Person. It was never a question of restoring an original fellowship in a perfect state lost in the dawn of human existence, but of leading up to spiritual fellowship a race slowly evolving religiously under the guidance of God. His efforts have been hindered by just those difficulties that obstruct any coming together of sundered personalities—ignorance, prejudice, latent or overt hostilities, and the self-regarding attitude generally. Now ultimately it is only personal action and influence that can overcome a disharmony of personalities. All God's endeavors through history in his providential discipline of men have been, or have led up to, his direct personal approach to the souls of men. Through the blind instinct of tribal self-preservation, in the development of the practice of sacrifice, by hard moral retribution, in prophetic exhortation, and the intuitions of seer and psalmist, God prepared the chosen people for his final revelation—a revelation that was more than any discipline or manifestation—that was a great and direct Deed. To a certain extent even this preparatory work had its success, for toward the close of the old dispensation we find that some of the finest spirits had already realized that religion is more than a matter of tabu and sacrifice, but a personal attitude toward a personal God. Was it not out of this sense of personal fellowship with God that the dawning belief in immortality took its rise? So that the stage was set for the coming of God in Christ, God the Infinite Person incarnate in a human personality.

Let us stand back a little from the picture, endeavoring to shake ourselves free from hampering theological prepossessions,

and ask ourselves just what it was that the historical Jesus sought to do, and actually accomplished in his life and death. Obviously his teaching was not his main work, fragmentary and occasional as it was in itself, and probably imperfectly preserved to us. He is an example of holiness under human conditions. He pours out his soul in divine benevolence upon the bodies and souls of men. But these things are obviously incidental. And even his death appears far too much a necessary part of his whole policy and program to be isolated from them. Whether we think of him as knowing the ultimate outcome from the beginning of his ministry or not, it is plain that his purpose was clear to himself throughout. What was that purpose? I suggest that it was *to create a situation and to force an issue*. However we define our Christology it is evident that Christ looks upon men from the standpoint of God and speaks to them with the voice of God. In himself he incarnates the personal God, and in his developing relations with men he incarnates the very situation that has always existed as a spiritual fact between God and men. With deliberate purpose he so acts and speaks as to gather up life's tangled moral threads and make them converge upon himself. In a word he reduces religion to a personal issue. He will not discuss side issues or abstract propositions. "The Will of God?" "*This is the Will of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.*"

And having created that situation he deliberately forces the issue. He thrusts it home in his controversy with the leaders of the people, challenging, provoking, making inevitable the murderous reaction. He need not have done it. There were probably other countries and peoples that would have welcomed such a Teacher. He brought about his own death; that is certain. It is not to be wondered at that a thinker like Nietzsche speaks of his death as a suicide. In a sense it was that. But we are conscious as we follow him making his way to Jerusalem for the final tragedy, that he is seeking no cowardly escape from the impossible burden of his task, but following out a clearly conceived purpose that includes death as the inevitable condition of achievement. He dies, and his cause seems to be extinguished in blood. He rises again, and the faith of his disciples is kindled to a blaze of world-

conquering passion. In the marvel of redemption they see the central Fact clearly, but its glory so dazzles them that they are unable to set it in its place in any final coherent system of thought. But what really happened? What, in ultimate reality, did God accomplish in the Cross of Christ? This at least, whatever of less or more we may wish to think; God Incarnate stood athwart the pathway of humanity drunk with the pride of sin. He stood with lifted hands, friendly but with inflexible purpose. He will turn them from their sins to God. He will not step aside, nor will men halt in their career. . . . God incarnate is ridden down, crushed, crucified. . . . Sin is blatantly triumphant. . . . And in its very triumph it defeats itself. In its judgment upon the Christ of God it pronounces judgment upon itself and becomes conscious of that judgment. God wins by allowing sin, rather by forcing sin to work itself out to its uttermost reaction against his redeeming purpose, in the person of the Lord. He reduces the age-long conflict of personalities, human and divine, to the concrete happening of historical fact. In that fact are set forth, placarded as it were upon the very heavens, the essential nature of sin as hostility to a personal God, and the essential nature of God's grace as the willingness to put forth divine effort and to suffer at men's hands, that he may win them to fellowship to himself. Without being able to explain it, men felt that it was *their* sin individually that had crucified Christ, and they saw in his willingness to die God's attitude of relentless goodwill toward themselves as sinners, and so they said most naturally, "He loved me and gave himself for me." And they were right. But it was through no artificial scheme, or transaction between the persons of the Godhead, but in the most direct way of approach to and dealing with sinful souls.

Beyond the possibility of dispute this is what Christ did, and this is what God accomplished through Christ. There may or may not be more involved, but this is certain. Whatever else may be true, this *must* be true. Here is solid ground. It is sufficient for me. It is at once big enough and simple enough and natural enough. The various schemes elaborated in the historic theories seem like so many side issues, blind alleys, into which men have

been turned by peculiarities of their mental outlook, accommodations of God's temple to their particular style of temple furniture.

Personality, we are coming to see, is the highest, the final category. Law, Holiness, Divine Honor—these are subsidiary. Satisfaction to Law, Holiness, or Sovereignty are inherently imperfect ways of thinking. There could be only one kind of satisfaction to a God who determines Law, and is holiness, but who is supremely a Person, and that is a reconciliation into a fellowship of life of his creature man, made a person also, in his image who created him.

[EDITORIAL NOTE—Many of our readers will be in sympathy with the above criticism of the many theories of the Atonement. Yet this caution is necessary—in spite of their insufficiency and defects, nearly every theory has certain values which cannot be wholly ignored in any study of historical theology. A friend of the editor once informed him that he was going to preach a series of sermons on the Atonement; when asked what theory he would present he responded: "I am going to preach them all!" There are two fundamental Christian doctrines, the Incarnation and the Atonement. Discussions of both subjects have and will appear in the Editorial Department of the *METHODIST REVIEW*.]

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF IMMORTALITY

RALPH TYLER FLEWELLING

Los Angeles, Cal.

THE source and the warrant of the human dream of immortality has furnished unending controversy. Neither the appeal to history, to science nor to individual experience has been at all satisfactory. It has assumed different forms with different civilizations and religions and in none has received perhaps such definite form as in the Christian faith. Even here there is much teaching about it which seems unwarranted in any words coming from the Founder of Christianity himself. Undoubtedly Christianity in its formative period was profoundly influenced at this point by the eschatological theories current at the time. It has been denied and doubted and assailed again and again, but the theory of immortality holds such comfort for man that it has never been successfully assailed. For this fact there must be some adequate reason and we believe it lies within the functioning of the human spirit itself.

I. THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF IMMORTALITY ARISES FROM THE
TIME-TRANSCENDING NATURE OF EXPERIENCE

It is doubtful if there is any other animal than man who is ever troubled with the notion of immortality. The animal is conscious of his surroundings and his relation to them, but to the animal man is granted the unique gift of consciousness of conscious states. In other words, he possesses the power of reflection upon his own moods. While the animal obeys impulses, man questions them, and out of this power of reflection arises man's moral world, the sense of moral responsibility and with it civilization and culture. He masters his world as the animal does not master it because he possesses the unique gift of mastering himself and his own thoughts.

There is reason, therefore, to take issue with a great body of present-day anthropological teaching which attempts to ground the consciousness of immortality upon visions of the dream state and

the division of personality arising out of the distinction between dreams and waking consciousness. The ground of the feeling of immortality lies rather behind these in that functioning of the human mind which enables it to reflect upon the nature of its dreaming as distinguished from its waking experience. There is little doubt that animals dream, there is no evidence to show that they reflect upon a dream state or distinguish between dream and waking experience. For a similar reason it seems far-fetched to attribute the rise of a belief in immortality to a belief in ghosts resulting from dreams of the dead. Here again we must go back to that fundamental functioning of the human mind which distinguishes the dream state from the waking state and identifies, perhaps, the dream state with continued existence in another world or spirit-plane of life. Neither is it quite reasonable to affirm that the theory of immortality (and with some all religion) arises out of fear of the dead. This fear is common in animals, without in any way giving rise to religious or moral reflections. We have here as in the case of the horse which fears to approach a dead body all the elements of psychological inhibitions except that part which in man arises from his power of reflection. The difference in the experience of the horse and the man is worlds apart for this very distinct reason which the behavioristic psychologists are prone to ignore.

The human mind has not been long at its work of interpreting experience until it becomes conscious of an order of time. In fact the second conscious experience is set up under a time relation to the first and to the perceiving self. Henceforth we have a growing consciousness of a double order—an order of experiences bearing relation to each other and an order of self-consciousness which observes and transcends the order of experience. Man is conscious of the past with relation to the present and very soon learns to project the present experience into the future, to reflect upon it and to act with it in mind. He thus becomes the master of time and being limited by it, yet transcends it. It will at once be objected that the animals likewise are "time-binders," to use the phrase of Count Korzybski, for we find them making provision for the future. The dog buries the bone against the morrow, the

bee provides against the coming winter, there are numberless instances. But it does not appear therefore that there is any reflective consciousness of time. The action may be as instinctive or "functional," to use a popular scientific expression, as the provision of the tree for the dissemination of its seed, or its preparation for approaching seasons. The absence of reflection is clearly shown in the case of animals by their utter lack of adjustment to a changed environment. The trap door spider, according to Fabre, if her work of building the nest which is to protect her eggs be interrupted will simply complete the operation from the point at which she was arrested. She has no power of reflection and cannot therefore go back and start again. She finishes off as if the previous work had not been destroyed, even though to do so means sure destruction for the eggs she is about to deposit. While therefore the animals may be declared "time-binders," the distinction relative to time, between themselves and man, is that man possesses the capability of reflection upon the order of consciousness. He is a time being if you please, but also a time-transcending being as well. Being time-transcending, having had countless experiences of the survival of time, he naturally expects to continue the survival of time. He cannot think of himself as non-surviving or non-existing; to do so would be paradoxical. The chief item of personal experience is continuity. Hence all theories of non-survival have had hard sledding because they fight the most fundamental consciousness of experience. On the other hand, a consciousness of immortality is functional and for its definite development only awaits the further progress of reflection. For this reason the growing reflection of man and the higher development of his powers of self-consciousness is sure to deepen his consciousness of the need for immortality.

II. THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF IMMORTALITY ATTENDS A TIMELESS ORDER OF LIVING

The conviction of immortality does not grow insistent except in the presence of an eternal order of living. This point is frequently overlooked by disbelievers in immortality. It is true that it may be repulsive when not raised to the higher plane and seen

sub specie aeternitas. There is no demand for the continuance of a life taken up merely with eating, drinking, and being clothed withal. A future state of unending wassail, while it has found its way into the Christian hymnal, is not Christian teaching. There is no obvious reason for the continuity of a life which lives only in and for things that perish with the using. Such an order of life becomes wearisome to the jaded pleasure-seeker even here and now, and its extension to all eternity would be a horror. This is the fertile source of much modern skepticism.

It is only as life takes hold upon the profounder issues that the demand for immortality becomes clear. If life is bent upon the interests that transcend time, then there is all the force of life demanding immortality. There is possible to man a self-forgetfulness of service which for far-reaching insight cannot be completed in the short span of his earthly career. There is possible love that shines even more clearly through the shadows of death and lives on undimmed by time and change. There is loyalty that passes the expression of the feeble years. To say that man's aspirations are raised to this consciousness only to be denied is not only to go contrary to whatever else we see in nature and life, but is also to deny the persistence of the most real values. The very reflections that lift him above the brute world and endow his life with greatness and worth must be taken as the illusory phantasm of a dream. I have said this is contrary to the experience of nature. Whatever functional instincts are given to tree and animal in the way of provision for propagation and care for their offspring are in general steadfastly met by nature. If the thistle wings its seeds the broadcasting air is not wanting, if the walnut builds a thick, hard coat for its germ of life, the winter is not far away. If the spider is gifted with functional instincts it is because those provisional instincts correspond to an existing reality. If then one result of man's functional reflection is the consciousness of continuity, there is reason to presume that there is something in reality corresponding to it.

If it be true that an eternal order of living demands immortality, it is further true that such an order of life alone can satisfy the human spirit. Of course there are examples enough of those

who seem satisfied with meat and drink and lust, but the common mind of the race repudiates them and follows after those who live by the higher order. And these who momentarily seem so well content are stirred betimes with dark misgivings as of those who throw away their richest opportunities and waste life. If life be lived after ideals that enlarge as they are realized, death becomes but the introduction into an order unlimited by temporal and spatial conditions in which whatever is willed is done.

The consciousness of immortality is further in strict accord with the logic of life and growth. The struggle of the individual for knowledge, his apprenticeship in the work of adjustment of his life to social relations and moral demands, call for an extension of time. Most men have only begun to learn how to live when death calls them. There are unnumbered evidences that the present life is only an apprenticeship in self-mastery and self-control, the anteroom to some vaster life. And man is the only being in nature whose earthly career takes on the aspect of fragmentariness. If one replies that such may be only in his own thoughts, the question arises why he alone of all creation has those most troublesome thoughts. To leave him without immortality is to truncate his possible span of usefulness and to make him unhappiest and least useful of all with no rational excuse for existence.

The belief in immortality has been much hindered by the false emphasis which is frequent in much religious teaching. This doctrine urges man to prepare for a future life as if that life were not already begun. Thus an unfortunate dualism dwells in it to defeat its own end. That future life, if it be a continuity, depends upon the order of life that is now participated in. If one is now living after the eternal order, he need not waste energy in useless conjecture as to the nature of that life to come. He is already learning how to live in God's world after a divine order and will be at home anywhere where God is King. His task is not to get to heaven, but to get heaven in his heart and life. His one concern here is to acclimate himself to God's high order of living, then death itself shall be but the opening of a door into a less limited life, but into one with which he is already familiar because he has lived according to the spiritual order.

III. IMMORTALITY IS INDIVIDUAL OR NOTHING

Much vogue is being given by writers on psychology and philosophy to the notion that the demand for immortality is satisfied by a sort of deathless or at least extended influence that one leaves behind in the memories of others. It needs only to remind ourselves in the face of such claims that such is immortality only in name. It could never satisfy a clean-cut reflective mind. The present life centers about personal experience. Its experiences are nothing if not individual. Life takes on unfolding meaning only as a person transcends time to gather the passing procession of events into a system of relations. All man's knowledge is dependent upon this. Upon it hang rationality, mental growth, and everything that makes life meaningful. The personal continuity through time and change is the thread upon which all hangs. Even to sink into Nirvana would not be immortality unless one were to keep the distinction of self-hood. Transmigration would not be immortality without a clear remembrance of its previous state. Pan-psychism would for similar reasons be equally meaningless. Immortality to be such has the same center as living experience, a continued and relating personality.

IV. IMMORTALITY IS OUTSIDE THE FIELD OF SCIENTIFIC DEMONSTRATION

That immortality is outside the field of scientific demonstration may at first glance appear a perilous statement in view of the efforts of present day scientists to thus establish it. It is possible to enter this denial, however, without denying any material facts which may be unearthed by psychical research. It is a far cry from the proof of thought transference, mental influences and all, to the scientific demonstration that they arise from ghostly sources. Barring the obvious and continuously practiced fraud (and in the line of his desire, the scientist is no less susceptible to fraud than other human beings), the research has never been put upon a basis satisfactory to science. It is equally unsatisfactory to religion. Fundamentally, by whatever name called, psychism, spiritualism or what-not, fundamentally it is materialism. It assumes the

notion popular with some scientists that materiality is identical with reality, and that there is nothing real which is not also material. It is not necessary here to point out the inevitable skepticism and uselessness for life of such an assumption. The claim is that the pint measure of materialism is sufficient for the measurement of all values and that whatever cannot be thus measured simply is not. Even a mother's love seems more real to this kind of a pseudo-scientist if he can state it in terms of chemical reaction or Oedipus complex, to such a swinish estate has much of our thinking fallen. The attempt to photograph spirits, or to construct a telephone through which they may speak, or to set forward a medium by whom they may communicate is a presumption that though they are of another order of life, their existence can be proved only in terms of this order.

The fact is that affairs of the soul are not materially demonstrable; they belong to another order. We cannot speak of the finer experiences of human relationship or of religion except in material figures of speech, which does fairly well to get ourselves understood by like-minded people until the literalist happens to compel our figures of speech to go on all fours. This the spiritist attempts to do with the result that he is false to every demand both of religion and of science.

We know only of that life to be through the glimpses and foregleams of our own souls testifying to the souls around. Should some return from that happy place, they could bear us no understanding of its conditions because there would be no language of common understanding. They could tell us only in terms we already know and we should be as blind after their speech as before. It is as with the modern psychological conception of love as a chemical reaction. When we have found that a chemical change has taken place, we know no more about love. Love is of another order and cannot be measured in material terms or reduced to the material. When you think you have it, it is just exactly what you have not. It may be after all that the insight of Paul was true, when the only description of heaven he attempted to give was this: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for those that love him."

SHAKESPEARE THE MAN¹

CALEB T. WINCHESTER (Deceased)

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

I HAVE heard somewhere of an Irish member on the floor of the House of Commons, who, after wrestling some time rather ineffectually with the difficulties of his subject, at last gave it up in despair, exclaiming as he sat down, "Mr. Speaker, I am bothered entirely for the lack of preliminary information." Anyone who ventures to speak upon the man Shakespeare will of course experience something of the same difficulty. We have no biography of the man. We never can have. All the certain facts of his career can be stated in two or three sentences. Nor is it easy, we are told, to discover in the great array of characters he has drawn any clear outline of his own personality; we are thwarted by the intensely dramatic character of his genius. Hamlet and Brutus and Antony; Cordelia and Rosalind and Imogen and all the rest of the wonderful company—these we know; but Shakespeare we have never heard speak.

So true is this that some very competent students and lovers of Shakespeare have pronounced the effort to form any clear picture of his personality hopeless and futile. "Shakespeare," says Browning, "never so little left his bosom's gate ajar." Says Matthew Arnold:

Others abide our question. Thou art free.

We ask and ask—Thou smilest and art still.

Sir Sidney Lee, in the latest edition of his *Life of Shakespeare*, avers that "no critical test has yet been found whereby to disentangle Shakespeare's personal feelings or opinions from those which he imputes to the creatures of his dramatic world."

Yet I must think such statements are exaggerated. The facts

¹ Copyright, 1922 by The Macmillan Company. From *The Old Castle and Other Essays* by Caleb T. Winchester, late Professor of English Literature in Wesleyan University. A full review of this noble book will appear in the next issue of the *METHODIST REVIEW*. This address is here printed by the courteous permission of the publishers and Mrs. Winchester.

we know of Shakespeare's life are certainly meager; but they are in several respects very significant. And are his plays so dramatic as to conceal their author entirely? Can anybody conceive it possible that a man should write over thirty great plays and never disclose anything of his own moral and emotional nature, his cast of mind and habits of observation? Of course no one thinks that we can read in any of Shakespeare's plays an exact transcript of his experience or of any phase of that experience. Everything is modified, transformed by his imagination. It may be difficult to find in his dramas his particular likes and dislikes; the more important question is, what sort of man must he have been who could make us acquainted with all this world of men and women? How did he himself come to know so many? Doubtless the picture we can form of Shakespeare's personality may be somewhat lacking in sharp, well-defined features; so is the picture you form of half of the men you know on the street. And as a rule, the more full and well-rounded a nature, the more difficult is it to analyze and depict. We incline to measure men by their limitations and their peculiarities. Eccentricities and prejudices are handy pegs on which to hang our labels, and a crank is much more easily imagined than a sage. But no man can read through Shakespeare's plays without forming at least some conception of Shakespeare's character. He knows for example, as Professor Bradley has said, that these plays could not have been written by such a man as Milton or Shelley or Wordsworth, and I am ready to add, by such a man as Bacon.

I wish then to state some few traits of the man William Shakespeare which I think we may all see in his life or infer from his work. First, consider for a moment the unquestioned facts of his life. They are only these. He was born probably on April 23, 1564. He married, after only once calling of the banns, at the age of eighteen, a woman eight years his senior; after his marriage he went up to London. How long after, we do not know. One of the best students of his life thinks it must have been as early as 1582. Another thinks that it could not have been earlier than 1586. What he went to London for we do not know, or what he did when he got there; only in 1592, when he had been in Lon-

don six to ten years, do we find the first mention of him as a playwright whose success was provoking the jealousy of his rivals. From that time for some fifteen years his plays were appearing in rapid succession; a casual mention by a minor writer shows that by 1598 he had written as many as twelve. Of his life during those London years we know only one thing—we know that he was not only making plays, but making money and investing it carefully and wisely. By 1605 he had purchased real estate in and near his native town of Stratford-on-Avon to the value of 920 pounds, which we may estimate as equivalent to about \$60,000 nowadays, and he certainly had other property in London also. Finally, somewhere between 1608 and 1611, he retired from London and came home to Stratford to spend the remainder of his days in the goodly house which he had purchased as early as 1597, and in which he died in 1616. These are all the facts we know beyond question; you can put them all into a sentence. He married at eighteen a wife who was twenty-five or twenty-six; at about twenty-one went up to London; in the course of the next twenty years achieved immortality and a rent-roll; at thirty-four bought a house and corner lot in his native village; at about forty-five settled down there to reside; at fifty-two died. That is the whole story.

Of course a great body of tradition has collected around these facts—that the young Shakespeare was a schoolmaster, a butcher, that he went up to London because of a difficulty over a deer-stealing adventure in Sir Thomas Lucy's park, that he held horses at the theater door, that he played the part of the ghost in Hamlet and did not play it well, that he was lame, that the Earl of Southampton gave him a thousand pounds for no clearly assigned reason, that he died of a fever brought on by drinking too late at Stratford one night with his old friend Ben Jonson, that he himself composed the doggerel verses on his tombstone—of such traditions there is legion, some of which may be true, more are probably false, and none can be certain. Then the undoubted facts of his life have given rise to numerous conjectures equally uncertain. Because he married, apparently with some haste, a woman eight years older than himself, it has been conjectured that the marriage proved an unhappy one, though there is not a particle of evidence

that it did. Then Shakespeare wrote a most interesting series of sonnets that seem to be autobiographical; many of us think they are autobiographical, and would throw a great deal of light on Shakespeare's London life if we could only agree upon any interpretation of them. And then comes Sir Sidney Lee and avers that nothing whatever can be inferred from the order of the sonnets, and that most of them have very slight autobiographical value, if any at all.

But throwing aside all tradition and doubtful conjecture, what can we read in the plain, unquestioned facts of this life? Can we form no conception of the eager youth who, refusing to measure his love by his fortune, makes a perhaps rash, certainly not a careful and prudent marriage; then, when the children come, goes up to London, carrying nothing of experience save what he has gained in the little provincial town and nothing of learning save the small Latin and less Greek that he has learned in the grammar school of that town; toils at the work he has chosen from four to seven years before he can see any one of his plays acted upon the stage and his great career really beginning? For you know there was nothing really precocious about the genius of Shakespeare. *Venus and Adonis*, which he says was the "first heir of the invention," was not published until 1593, when he was twenty-nine years old, though possibly written a little earlier. "*Love's Labor's Lost*," probably the first play written entirely by him, may be dated possibly as early as 1591. What of those years of apprenticeship in London? How comes it that the youngster who at twenty or twenty-one is holding horses at the theater door or playing minor parts on the stage, at twenty-eight or twenty-nine is writing a poem that he ventures to dedicate to the Earl of Southampton, and is a dangerous rival to the foremost playwrights of the day? Grant his genius, admit that he must have had by nature marvelous gifts of expression; yet such a record proves a great intensity of nature and an impassioned interest in human life.

But his London life surely proves also that, however intense and impassioned his temperament, he must have had it under control. The Shakespeare of the London years was no mere Bohe-

mian, still less was he, like Marlowe and Greene and almost all his fellow playwrights, a reckless and dissolute man. Nobody claims that his life in those years can be proved altogether exemplary. If, as seems to me probable, the sonnets are mostly autobiographical, there is indication in some of them of an episode of darker passion which for a time overcame his conscience and his reason. It is just possible that some of the stories of irregularities in those years have some foundation, though nothing of the kind rests on any good evidence. On the contrary, the only bit of documentary evidence as to Shakespeare's private life in London, recently discovered by our American scholar, Professor Wallace, proves that, for some years before and after 1604, he was living in the house of one Mountjoy, a Huguenot refugee, maker of ladies' head-dresses, and that he took a practical and kindly interest in the domestic affairs of that family. And we certainly need no evidence that a man of reckless and dissolute life could not have written two or three plays a year for twelve or fourteen years, plays steadily growing in intellectual power and moral soundness with every year. And if you say this is accounted for by his wonderful genius, then remember the bare fact I have mentioned, that all through those years he was making money—not spending it, but saving it, investing it shrewdly and collecting his rents and income very rigorously. This is the one thing in his career about which there can be no doubt. There are, I know, people who find it difficult to associate such thrift with the highest poetical genius, and get a kind of shock at knowing that Shakespeare prosecuted a townsman for a debt of one pound ten shillings' worth of malt while he was writing *Macbeth*. But nothing can be more certain, I think, than that the genius of the man William Shakespeare had a foundation of solid common sense and business sagacity.

One other thing notice. However long his stay in London, however many the attractions and distractions of life there, he always considered Stratford-on-Avon his home and always intended to return there. The earliest plays, like "*Love's Labor's Lost*," "*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*," and "*A Midsummer Night's Dream*," are full of reminiscences of Stratford. In the

"Midsummer Night," indeed, you may say there is nothing else; and the latest plays, especially "The Winter's Tale," if I read it aright, are full of the deep and quiet satisfaction of return to early life and early love. There is no evidence, then, that Shakespeare had forsaken or forgotten his wife and children at home. With what was probably the first considerable sum of money he could save he bought for them in 1597 a goodly house in Stratford, and the following year proceeded to put it in repair and plant an orchard about it. For the next twelve years he would seem to have spent annually in New Place and in the purchase or lease of real estate in the vicinity, sums equivalent to nearly four thousand dollars a year. He was not indifferent to outward tokens of rank, and as early as 1599 succeeded in obtaining the grant to bear a coat of arms, for which his father had applied unsuccessfully. When he came back to Stratford about 1610, he was probably in wealth and social consideration the most important person in his native village.

Now I wish to put beside these facts, which may seem to indicate a nature unattractively mundane and practical, the only two recorded comments made upon Shakespeare's nature by eye-witnesses during those London years. A publisher named Chettle says he is sorry for having printed some months before depreciatory remarks with reference to Shakespeare's works, because he has himself since come to know him personally and seen his demeanor, "no less civil than he is excellent in the quality he professes." Besides, he adds, other people have reported "his uprightness of dealing which argues his honesty." Honesty, you know, meant more then than at present. It meant honor, courtesy. And Ben Jonson, who knew him well, declared, "I loved the man and do honor his memory on this side idolatry as much as any. He was indeed honest, and of an open and free nature." And in Jonson's lines on the folio portrait he says, you remember:

This figure that thou here seest put,
It was for gentle Shakespeare cut.

That epithet "gentle" seems to have been often applied to Shakespeare in later years. Doubtless it has a wide and vague meaning,

but it always implies at least something of courtesy and affability. Men never spoke of gentle Marlowe, or even, I should say, of gentle John Milton. Such testimonies, meager as they are, certainly give us some hints of the temperament which one thinks made friends for Shakespeare in those London years among all sorts of people, from the brilliant young Earl of Southampton to the plain Huguenot "tire-maker," Mountjoy, in whose house he lived.

And now this picture of the man Shakespeare that we form from the meager facts of his life is confirmed, I believe, by the inferences we draw from the dramas. In the first place the range and variety of the persons in those dramas is proof of the openness and geniality of Shakespeare's temper as a man. How did he come to create so many different men and women—some seven hundred of them? I say create; but strictly speaking the imagination never does create. It only expands, transforms, and combines the elements of experience into new wholes. Shakespeare in some sense must have known something of all those people, and he could not have known them if he had not been a companionable man who liked people and was by them. Your great dramatist can never be a lofty, isolated man like Milton, or a visionary idealist like Shelley, or a misanthrope like Swift, or a philosopher like Coleridge, or a retired and solitary thinker like Wordsworth. These men may know something of what they call human nature, as they learn it by introspection and reflection, but they do not know men and women, they do not know life. They have each only a narrow circle of friends. But for Shakespeare the world was full of interesting folk. Of narrative invention he had comparatively little; the plots of his plays, as everybody knows, are all borrowed and sometimes not very well borrowed, put together in hasty, impossible fashion. But the characters are always vital—real men and women. You feel sure that Shakespeare has known them. He was not, I suppose, a reader of many books; Holinshed's *Chronicles for English History*, and Plutarch's *Lives* for the classical world seem to have sufficed him. But the characters whom he found in books lived in his imagination as really as those that had entered there through his marvelous observation.

Indeed, observation is hardly the word to describe the method of Shakespeare's acquaintance with men and things. It implies too passive a relation. His observation proper was indeed marvelously exact, his eye marvelously acute. He saw common things, for example, as you and I do not. Do you know what is the most characteristic thing about a violet? That it is modest or humble? Anybody knows that. That it is blue? Thousands of flowers are blue—though if Shakespeare wished to mention its color he would likely specify in some poetic way the shade of blue, as of the pale wood violet, of which he says it is sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes. But Shakespeare noticed that the most characteristic thing about a violet is that it has a habit of gently nodding on its stem:

Where oxalips and the nodding violet grows.

Or again:

As gentle
As zephyrs blowing below the violet,
Not wagging his sweet head.

Did you ever notice that? Do you know just how many spots there are in the bottom of a cowslip? Shakespeare did:

On her left breast
A mole cinque-spotted like the crimson drops
I' the bottom of a cowslip.

Scores of examples of this nicety of vision might be cited if I were talking of Shakespeare's poetry, but what I am now insisting is that his larger observation of men and things was always active. It not only sees, it interprets what he sees. Shakespeare's temperament, we feel sure, was always alert and eager. He lived with men, he knew men, was spontaneously interested in and sympathized with them.

Consider his humor, for a man's humor is generally a pretty good test of his attitude toward his fellow men and his enjoyment of life. What a genial and kindly humor it is. He does not care much for loud and empty mirth; there is not in his plays much of that laughter that is like the crackling of thorns under a pot. His best comedies, like "As You Like It," seem an expression of the full, healthy joyousness of living. But while his humor of

course usually plays about some of the manifold contrasts and inconsistencies of this varied life of ours, his humorous people are never mere eccentrics or freaks; they all belong to our family. We must own them as men and brothers. There are in the company, for example, a good many of those people whom we, when we see them in real life, are apt to classify complacently as stupid people—Mrs. Quickly, Dogberry, Verges, Bardolph, Shallow, Slender, and all the rest. Yet Shakespeare never assumes any air of superiority to them. He vastly enjoys their company, and, what is more to the point, you are sure they enjoyed his. Often his humor is so touched with kindly human sympathy that it seems to shade imperceptibly into pathos. You remember old Justice Shallow's reminiscences with Cousin Silence, "Jesu, Jesu, the mad days that I have spent. And to see how many of my old acquaintances are dead!" "We shall all follow," says Silence. "Certain, 'tis certain; very sure, very sure. Death, as the Psalmist saith, is certain to all; all shall die. How a good yoke of bullocks at Stamford fair?" And everybody remembers Mrs. Quickly's account of the last moments of Jack Falstaff. "After I saw him fumble with the sheets and play with flowers, and smile upon his fingers' ends, I knew there was but one way; for his nose was as sharp as a pen, and a' babbled of green fields."

Not that Shakespeare's humor never has a satiric quality, but he generally reserves his satire for those people who are somehow hollow, who assume an inflated dignity or bigness—Bottom, old Polonius, Malvolio, ancient Pistol, and their like. These people he laughs at, rather than laughs with. What Carlyle somewhere calls "pretentious ineptitude" was evidently very amusing to Shakespeare, but also somewhat annoying. Yet even here his humor is not bitter or cynical. The generally cynical temper seemed a tragic thing to Shakespeare—as you can see in his *Timon*—a thing to be pitied or feared.

Are there then no types of character that this man really hated? Well, not many; the man who really knows men and women as Shakespeare did will find something to touch his sympathy in almost every life. "Hate that man," said Charles Lamb once, "how could I hate him? Don't I know him?" Yet there

were men whom Shakespeare, I think, regarded with unmixed aversion, almost hatred. Who is the worst man in Shakespeare's world? Everybody will say without much hesitation, Iago. Why? Because Iago is the embodiment of absolute selfishness. Envy and the love of personal power make him blind to innocence and contemptuous of virtue. A hard, deceitful, scheming, merciless man. Goneril and Regan, in "Lear," belong to the same class. Now a nature like Shakespeare's, open and free, as Ben Jonson called it, finds such characters as these intolerable.

Do we find any confirmation in the dramas for that practical wisdom, that power of self-control which seems so certain in the meager records of Shakespeare's London life? I think we can. I find that in Shakespeare's world it is just this practical wisdom, this poise and self-control that insures success and consideration. Says Hamlet to Horatio:

Blest are those
Whose blood and judgment are so well commingled
That they are not a pipe for Fortune's finger
To sound what stop she please. Give me that man
That is not passion's slave, and I will wear him
In my heart's core, ay, in my heart of heart,
As I do thee.

Now this type of man, strong but well balanced, self-controlled, cannot be the hero of tragedy and not often of comedy, and so we shall not expect to find many examples of the type in Shakespeare's plays. Yet there are such men, and they always in some way seem to have Shakespeare's approval and admiration. Horatio himself is an example, and Theseus in "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and the banished Duke in "As You Like It," and best of all, Henry the Fifth. It has been often said that Henry the Fifth was Shakespeare's favorite hero; and there is some reason to think so. He has drawn out his story as Prince and King through three plays, and in the choruses of "Henry V," speaking for once as if in his own person, has given him such enthusiastic praise that it seems probable we have in Henry a type of character Shakespeare himself admired. Now Henry, while he is Prince Hal, cares little for decorum and throws himself heartily enough into the humors of Falstaff and of the Boar's Head. Yet in his

wildest days he never quite forgets his duty; and when the call for manly action comes, he is ready, throws off—perhaps rather too cruelly—Falstaff and his roistering companions and takes up the duties of kingship. Yet he keeps always a certain boyish exuberance of spirits, he likes all sorts of people and, though king, is still a good fellow. But he never loses mastery of himself, he never makes mistakes, he is never impatient, he never gets angry. I think there is a great deal of William Shakespeare in this King Henry the Fifth.

And if this poise and self-control is a condition of success, the lack of it means failure—often tragic failure. In the great tragedies of Shakespeare you will find that the catastrophe comes either from a lack of passion as motive power or from a failure to direct and control such passion. Characters as unlike as Hamlet and Mark Antony both go down because their blood and judgment are not well commingled.

But, you will ask, is this all we know of the man Shakespeare, this energetic, facile, kindly, marvelously observant, but rather mundane man that we see in the meager records of his life? Hardly. The deepest things in any man's thinking and feeling, certainly in any poet's thought and feeling, are not seen in the story of his outward business and affairs. Yet up to about 1600, when Shakespeare was, you remember, thirty-six years of age, this is the type of man seen in his work. For, with the exception of the young man's romantic tragedy of love and death, "*Romeo and Juliet*," the work is all comedy, dealing mostly with the lighter and more joyous sides of life, or history, in which the fate of the individual is involved in the great sweep of national affairs. Shakespeare, one thinks, as yet has not much considered the deeper and darker problems of life. But then suddenly his work changes. The comedy darkens in "*Measure for Measure*" and "*All's Well*," and then for some five or six years he writes tragedy, and nothing but tragedy. Why this change in the temper of his work we do not know, but of one thing we may be quite sure; it was no good easy man, altogether unstirred by stronger passions and unvexed by obstinate questions, that wrote that great series of tragedies, "*Hamlet*," "*Othello*," "*Macbeth*," "*Lear*," "*Antony*," "*Timon*."

There are some indications, especially in the sonnets, of some emotional agitation in Shakespeare's private life about that time. But setting aside all mere conjecture, it is certainly not improbable that something in the intimate personal experience of Shakespeare during those years may have forced his thought upon the great problems of sin and suffering. I have often thought it strange and perhaps significant that the line of tragedies begins with "Hamlet," the only play in which the tragedy is not external but internal, the tragedy of doubt and skepticism that puzzles the will and benumbs all our active faculties. It is as if at the outset of this tragic period Shakespeare was dwelling in thought not so much upon the external pain and sorrow in this unintelligible world, as upon the meaning and mystery of it all. No other play is so full of spiritual doubt and wonder; no other play suggests so many of those problems for which every thoughtful man sometimes yearns to find solution; no other play is so enfolded in an atmosphere of the supernatural. And in all the later tragedies the interest is primarily ethical, not external; the catastrophe is never merely physical or melodramatic. These tragedies are so supremely great not because of any thrilling dramatic situation or harrowing exhibition of passion, but because of their absolute truth to the deepest and most solemn laws of our human nature. Nowhere has Shakespeare so clearly shown the sternness and sanity of his moral judgments. Sometimes, as in "Macbeth" or "Antony and Cleopatra," he shows us the inevitable ruin that follows unbridled passion, whether of ambition or of lust. These plays are not didactic in purpose. Shakespeare is no preacher. He is simply holding the mirror up to nature. And he has none of that cheap morality that is afraid to tell the truth. In the play of "Antony and Cleopatra," for example—one of the most powerful of his works—he knows that Antony did not lose the world for nothing. He knows that the pleasures of sin, though they be but for a season, are very real pleasures while they last. And he makes us see it too. As we read, something of the magic of this great queen of the world falls over us. We understand the enchantment that is upon Antony, and when we understand that we cannot stand aloof in cool indifference and condemn him. Yet all this dazzle

of the lust of the eyes and the pride of life does not for a moment blind us to the quality of Antony's action, and the inevitable doom which he is every moment nearing. Precisely there resides the tragedy. We see his manhood ebbing away, his iron resolution growing soft and pliant, and "his captain's heart, which in the scuffles of great fights" had "burst the buckles on his breast," losing its soldier's temper, and, warmed no longer by any chaste or temperate affection, bursting at last in shame and despair. There could be no higher proof of Shakespeare's moral steadiness of vision and self-command than his power to depict with even-handed justice at once the charms and the results of sin.

In the other type of tragedy, like "Othello" and "Lear," we have that spectacle, more awful because more unintelligible, of the triumph of guilt and hatred over innocence and nobility. Such plays leave us dazed in wonder and pity; yet feeling through all confusion and agony of soul that purity and truth are supremely beautiful things, better than happiness, better than life. Who would not rather die as Desdemona than live as Iago? In "Lear" it is the old, gray-haired king, the generous Kent, and the heavenly Cordelia that go down before the awful storm of wrong; but, as the dying king bends, blind and crazed, over the lifeless body of his daughter and moans, "Cordelia, Cordelia, stay a little," who does not feel that in all the defeats and contradictions of this unintelligible world the only thing of priceless value is a pure and heroic life?

This great series of tragedies certainly proves that the deeper and darker phases of human life were passing through the study of Shakespeare's imagination in the years from 1600 to 1606, but I do not see that they present anything really inconsistent with the conception of Shakespeare's character that we form from the record of those years or from a study of his earlier work. They enlarge and deepen that conception; they do not contradict it. Nay, in one respect they confirm it, for, if I mistake not, there is indication even in these tragedies of that breadth of sympathy, that sense of fellowship with all men, which is one of the most obvious traits of the man. An unflinching recognition of the strictest moral laws is not inconsistent with a pity for the victims of

their violation. Consider Shakespeare's bad men and women. For only two or three, as I have said, has he an unmixed hatred, but Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra, the King in Hamlet, Shylock, and all the rest, it is only with some touch of charity for them and pity for their sin and ruin that we leave them at the last. It was in this large, hopeful, and kindly temper, surely befitting the greatest of dramatists, that Shakespeare looked out upon this world.

I think one is glad to know that this tragic mood was not dominant in the latest work or the latest years of Shakespeare's life. After about twenty years' connection with the stage in London, the purpose we think he had cherished during all those years was fulfilled and Shakespeare came home to Stratford-on-Avon. Sir Sidney Lee thinks it was in 1611. Some students think it may have been a year or two before that. In fact, his return was probably gradual, his visits to Stratford growing more frequent as he gradually gave up his connection with the theater in London; and by 1611 we may believe he was settled for the rest of his life in New Place with his wife and daughters. Now it was pretty certainly in the year 1610-11 that Shakespeare wrote the three plays I think we love best of all, "Cymbeline," "The Winter's Tale," and "The Tempest." These plays are not tragedies, nor are they exactly comedies either. They are plays of rest after struggle, of reconciliation after suspicion, of home and finality. In two of them—"Cymbeline" and "The Winter's Tale"—the central character is a wife, cruelly suspected by her husband but winning back at last by unwavering fidelity the trust that has always been deserved. Imogen and Hermione are the crown of womanhood in Shakespeare's world. Then these three plays picture, as never before in Shakespeare's pages, the coy and gentle charm of girlhood, not now with the rapture of the lover, but with the wise and tender solicitude of a father; it is not Romeo and Juliet, but Prospero and Miranda, Leontes and Perdita. And, furthermore, these plays are redolent of the charm of country life, of green fields and gardens and flowers. We are in the country again, as in the days of "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and Perdita's garden is even lovelier than the bank whereon sometime

Titania slept. The plays are as wise as ever; and Shakespeare's grasp of character as firm and his sense of beauty I think deeper than in the earlier plays; but the glow of passion is cooled and all three plays, whatever the suspicion or harshness in the earlier acts, all end as with a deep and long-drawn breath of quiet content.

Now I am well aware of the folly of trying to find in Shakespeare's plays any close transcript of the events of his personal career; yet no one can convince me that the general tone of all these last plays is not that of Shakespeare's renewed family life at Stratford-on-Avon. I find no sure evidence that there was ever any estrangement or jealousy between Shakespeare and his wife during his long years in London; but if there had been, I am sure it was over by 1610. That such a play as "The Winter's Tale" could have been written in that society which the experience of Solomon pronounces worse than "a continual dropping in a very rainy day"—that would be stranger than any miracle. No, I feel sure that the record of those latest years, as interpreted by these plays, may make us certain that Shakespeare, like Wordsworth's Happy Warrior, was after all, certainly in these later years,

a Soul whose master-bias leans
To homefelt pleasures and to gentle scenes.

and that however wide the circuit of his work, he closes it at last with pictures of those affections that bloom fair in the garden of home.

The image we can thus form of the man must at best be somewhat vague, lacking in those specific and picturesque features in which character is most easily read; but I think we can be sure of its main outlines—a positive, well-balanced man, of strong passions under firm control, genial and interested in all sorts of people, with marvelous powers of observation and an imagination to interpret all he saw into lasting forms of life and beauty. And I think one's conception of Shakespeare's character loses something of breadth and truth when we try to separate the man from the poet, as I have half unconsciously been doing. For we tend to forget that there were not two Shakespeares. The poet who ruled a vast demesne

on the heights of Parnassus was the same man who owned a house and corner lot in Stratford-on-Avon. The dramatist whose speech delights us by an affluence of power and beauty such as none of his contemporaries could approach, is the same man who could lean over the gate of New Place of a morning to jest with Dogberry or chat with Goodman Verges. And in opposition to all that has been said about the impossibility of knowing anything of William Shakespeare, I must say that I think one rises from a study of his life and work with something like a sense of personal acquaintance with the man. One feels at least, as old Ben Jonson said, that he was honest and of an open and free nature, a man to know.

One other question there is which on this day¹ we cannot forbear to ask. Was Shakespeare a religious man? We get no answer from the recorded facts of his life. The tradition that he disliked the Puritans, based mostly on a misinterpretation of some one or two pages in "Twelfth Night" and "All's Well," and the tradition that he died a Roman Catholic, first heard of a hundred years after his death in the talk of a gossiping clergyman, are both valueless. I think the answer to the question must depend on the meaning we give to the question itself. If religion be only, as Matthew Arnold once defined it, morality touched with emotion, then we may perhaps venture to call Shakespeare a religious man. He certainly recognized the nature and the imperative demands of morality; he saw that the highest values in life are always moral values. We may be sure also that he was a reverent man. We shall find in his plays no flippant or contemptuous references to religious belief or practice, save on the lips of men who were themselves shallow or base. More than this, there is evidence enough in such plays as "Hamlet" that Shakespeare had pondered the meanings and the mystery of life. He could have been no stranger to those thoughts that are beyond the reaches of our souls. What solutions he ever reached for those deepest problems that vex the thinking soul, we do not know; it seems to me likely that he put them aside as insoluble, and in his later years sought quiet and

¹ This paper was first delivered as an address in celebration of the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death.—L. B. G.

content within the realm of positive knowledge. We may well be slow in pronouncing upon any man's religion; that is a matter between himself and his God. But we may not uncharitably say that in reading Shakespeare's pages we long for one thing, and for one thing only. With this all-embracing knowledge that seems to include almost the whole realm of human nature, could we but have a little faith. If the vision that saw so clearly and justly all the facts of human life could have had some faith in things unseen. Surely of such faith the saintly Cordelia, the noble Hermione, the gentle Desdemona, the Hamlet of Luther's Wittenberg might have known something. But among the very latest words of the great magician who created them all are these, which sound with a solemn pathos down the centuries:

We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

He was true to the facts of knowledge only. He showed the human soul as it is; he carried it through all the tangled web of circumstance, the struggles of good and evil, the joys and pains that make up this life of ours here, quite down to the moment when the fevered play is quite played out; "the rest is silence." We need one other book beside our Shakespeare; we need our Bible.

SHAKESPEARE THE MORALIST

PHILIP L. FRICK

Schenectady, N. Y.

SHAKESPEARE is the King of Literature. By common consent he is acknowledged to be without a peer across the glorious centuries of human endeavor. He is preeminently the ten-talent man. Measured not merely by his contemporaries but by the great who went before him and those who have come after him, he is recognized gladly and unhesitatingly as one of earth's master-spirits, defining for us God's measure of a human being. Praise of him is so extravagant that were it not sincere it would be pitifully ridiculous. Swinburne's encomium is accepted by some as sober truth when he says, "If nothing were left of Shakespeare but the single tragedy of King Lear it would still be plain as it is now that he was the greatest man that ever lived." Men do not question his rightful claim to preeminence. They accept him as they do the sun, flooding the skies with light; or as Mount Everest, topmost ice-garmented peak of Himalaya's ranges. He is the definition of a "genius." His productions are the glory and marvel of literature. Of them it has been said, "They are the richest, the purest, the wisest, the fairest that genius uninspired ever produced." The race is indeed glorified in him. All people are his debtors, since, prodigal of riches as is springtime, he has dowered all with his affluence. All the centuries shall sing his praise because none can outgrow him. After three centuries men are surer of his right to literary immortality than ever before.

For this acknowledged supremacy there is abundant reason. Not by accident has his majestic reputation come to him. It is an achievement. He has earned his glory among men. They honor him because they recognize in him sublime qualities that have capacitated him to be a world-teacher.

His sheer mentality amazes us. His was the quintessence of intellectuality. All things seem to have revealed their secrets to his eager, Titan mind. He knew life in all of its soul movements,

its enthusiasms, its passions, its emotions, its aspirations, its foibles, its weaknesses, its struggles, its defects, its victories, its guilt, its tragedies, its transfigurations. He could read the heart of a man as if it had been an open volume. All types of character have apparently whispered to him their inner secrets. Kings, queens, courtiers, fools, witches, adventurers, saints, bigots, panderers, tyrants, peasants, toilers—all have revealed to him the secrets of their hearts. His six hundred dramatic personalities stand out from his pages with all the reality of historical beings. Indeed, as do the persons in the parables of Christ, they seem to be more real than life itself, because they are elemental, complete, full-orbed types of humanity. As a writer has said, "He lived a life more crowded with ideas, passions, relations, and events than any potentate the world has ever seen. He projected himself into almost all the varieties of human character, and in imagination lived the life of each. No other man has ever seen human life from so many points of view. He knew what was in man because he felt it in himself."

He is at home in all ages. In "Julius Cæsar," "Coriolanus," and "Antony and Cleopatra," he has caught the spirit of imperial yet decadent Rome. Glorious Greece lives again in "Pericles," "Troilus and Cressida," "Timon of Athens." Merry England is faithfully photographed in "Richard III," "Henry VIII," "Merry Wives of Windsor." Italy's customs and institutions and history are faithfully portrayed in the "Merchant of Venice," "Othello," "Romeo and Juliet," "Measure for Measure." Indeed, as Ben Jonson exclaimed, "He is not of one age, but for all time." Just because of his range of sympathy and keenness of insight into life's varieties and his marvelous power of clear presentation of noble thought, no writer except the Bible authors has given to the world so much that is wise and beautiful and sublime and dependable and enduring.

And it is just this tremendous power of dealing with things fundamental that makes Shakespeare the great moralist. Never would his reputation and influence have been so marvelous and abiding had he not dealt with all the sublimities that inhere in the human soul, and which come to their expression in the manifold

and complex thoughts and deeds of mankind. How pitifully superficial the criticism that he is not a religious writer. Of course he made no pretense at being a technical theologian, expatiating upon some cherished item of a creed. That was not within his province as a dramatist. Never did he attempt, as did Tennyson or Milton or Browning, in separate poems, to amplify some particular religious belief. But the reader who does not detect in him a fundamental religious instinct has missed his genius. There is not a cardinal Christian doctrine to which he does not give repeated utterances. He is saturated with the Bible. Having been trained as a lad under the careful tutelage of a Puritan teacher, he imbibed that reverence and love for the Bible that makes it appear by direct quotation and by allusion in hundreds of his passages. He was preeminently a religious man, as do testify the countless references to God and Christ. Faith in God is always exalted. Trust in his providential leading is repeatedly claimed. Never does he speak irreverently or frivolously of those central beliefs of the heart that are vital to the religious life. Bishop Charles Wordsworth says, "Take the entire range of English literature, put together our best authors who have written upon subjects not professedly religious or theological, and we shall not find, I believe, in them all united, so much evidence of the Bible having been read and used as we find in Shakespeare alone." In "Hamlet" alone, for example, there are nearly one hundred passages that are Bible allusions. Something like one thousand parallelisms, as Mudge points out, have been discovered in his plays. To all the fundamental Christian doctrines he makes reference repeatedly, until he reveals himself, as some one says, "the ardent teacher of Providence, future retribution and reward, the inevitable consequences of sin, life after death." Surely we must believe that he honored Christ. Nobly he speaks regarding one of his characters who "gave his pure soul unto his Captain Christ, under whose colors he had fought so long."

That he believed profoundly and implicitly in immortality is gloriously testified to in the opening paragraph of his last will and testament, which reads, "I commend my soul into the hands of God, my Creator, hoping and assuredly believing, through the

merit of Jesus Christ my Saviour, to be made partaker of life everlasting." With childlike simplicity does he refer to "Christ's dear blood shed for our grievous sins." Taking him all in all therefore, no error is made regarding him when he is referred to as "decidedly a Christian poet."

But the supreme reason for Shakespeare's glory and influence lies in his sovereignty as a moral teacher. Not the brilliance of his genius, nor the luxuriousness of his diction, nor the breadth of his understanding, but his strict and unswerving loyalty to ethical principles is what makes him the world-acknowledged master. Jonson in his interesting biographical sketch asserts that Shakespeare "never writes with a moral purpose." But, mark you, never does he violate or disregard the holy moralities. As a dramatist, to be sure, his business was never to deal in monographs extolling any single ethical virtue. His art and his skill and his loyalty go deeper. Never is there absent from one of his dramas the moral background. He writes as one who can never forget that certain things are unequivocally and eternally true and vital. And just because of this quality does he transcend so greatly some other dramatists and poets upon whom mankind showered its praise. Great as Goethe was in some respects, the world has never trusted him. His "Faust" in parts seems almost like the glorification of lasciviousness. It is not strange that a distinguished critic said that we are afraid to read Goethe. The German poet himself, vitiated by ethical laxity, could not see straight morally. He is only a modern pagan, ill concealing his ethical aberrations. The brilliant Byron? Some of his poetry is as filthy as a city sewer—rottenness everywhere! Art for smut's sake! Poor Burns! We have not forgotten regarding him that some of his poems are so hopelessly vile, so utterly depraved, that to send them through the United States mail is a misdemeanor. How gloriously Shakespeare lives above these! Never is his consummate skill dedicated to the glorification of the prurient or lecherous or debasing.

Nor can any more searching questions be asked of a man of genius whose works are to have circulation among the multitudes than these: What does he think of God's laws? Does he honor the pure, the good, the noble, the worthy, the spiritual? Does the

soul rise from communion with him, strengthened, purged, nerved, cheered, ennobled; or have life's majestic ideals been shattered, the standards lowered, the insidious poisons injected, the tastes cheapened, the righteous will weakened, the love of God withered? How does he treat those life sublimities which slowly, painfully through tragic experiences, through tremendous soul-agonies, the race has come to recognize as the majestic laws of God and the indispensable principles of human happiness and welfare? Does he laugh at them as prudishness; does he sneer at them as Puritanic; does he deride them as irrelevant limitations upon his freedom? Does to him virtue seem spurious and vice appear lovely? Is evil welcomed and good rejected? Does chastity appear a light thing and honor a commodity to be sold to the highest bidder? Are honesty and uprightness, faithfulness and sincerity, pity and gentleness, courage and generosity, justice and mercy, only fortuitous and irrelevant? Does to him vice seem anything but ugly; cowardice and jealousy, villainy and tyranny, rage and animality, anything but hideous and odious and fatal? Then beware! Then count him a menace, an insidious foe, a secret enemy! The Athenians charged Socrates with being, through his teachings, a corrupter of youth. A grievous allegation, if true! Even the pagan Grecians saw that to undermine morality meant destruction not merely to the individual but to the state.

How does our glorious Shakespeare meet the test? Never in the slightest degree do the eternal virtues suffer at his hands. He is guardian of man's highest interests. He is literature's supreme moralist, exalted enough, in many respects, to be counted as co-worker with some of the Scripture writers. No author so splendidly supplements the wisdom of the Bible. Many of his majestic moral aphorisms are veritable footnotes on holy Scripture. Being a photographer of actual life, he could not but make at times licentious allusions, and record vice and infamy and evil in many of its hideous forms. But never did he defend, mitigate or extol these. Never does he fail to make the soul feel that these are fatal aberrations, hideous abnormalities, despicable and injurious defects. Does he depict crime? He makes us shudder at it. He paints it with unerring moral accuracy as repulsive and suicidal.

Never does he strike a false moral note. He preserves a pure art. As a critic says, "He flattered no bad passion, disguised no vice in the garb of virtue, trifled with no just and generous principle. While causing us to laugh at folly, and shudder at crime, he still preserves our love for our fellow-beings and our reverence for ourselves." Knowing the moral law, he gave it the place of supreme sovereignty in life. Nor could he ever have been the world's master literary teacher, had he not thus enthroned morality.

Briefly let us note several respects in which he thus extols the moral verities. Never has there been in literature a more passionate exponent of the inexorableness of the moral law. What Paul wrote in a single sentence, "God is not mocked; what a man soweth, that shall he also reap," Shakespeare interpreted throughout his tremendous plots. Disobedience to the majestic love of God, written in the heart of all mankind, can be attended by nothing but disaster. God's judgments never go astray. Shakespeare delineates many black characters, ugly in selfishness, stubborn in perversity, hideous in abnormality. He knows how bold and reckless and defiant sin may become. But never does sin escape the dire results of its unholiness. Over and over again the sublime principle is illustrated. In "King Richard the Third" he declares:

The great King of kings
Hath in the table of his law commanded
That thou shalt do no murder . . .
Take heed; for he holds vengeance in his hand,
To hurl upon their heads that break his law.

What is the story of Othello but the record of wild jealousy's pitiable harvest, as the otherwise magnanimous Moor is incited to suspicion and abuse of his dutiful Desdemona by the revengeful, deceitful Iago? Duped by the villainous Iago, Othello loses those finer graces that make him the ideal lover as his heart hardens with suspicion against his innocent wife, falsely accused of illicit love, until in bitter resentment he suffocates her. Of course we cannot but despise the malignant Iago, who must pay for his villainy with his own life. We cannot but sympathize with the deluded, repentant, heart-broken Othello as we hear him cry, before he plunges the dagger into his own heart,

Whip me, ye devils,
From the possession of the heavenly sight,
Blow me about in winds, roast me in sulphur;
Wash me in steeped-down gulfs of liquid fire!
O Desdemon! dead, Desdemon! dead!
Oh! Oh!

Always do we know regarding Shakespeare's plots that "things come out right." Coriolanus, haughty, defiant, oppressive, tyrant of Rome, must be ruthlessly killed. Shylock, Jewish money lender, grasping, calculating, revengeful, bloodthirsty, loses everything—daughter, home, possessions. Never does Shakespeare depict lust and lechery except to bring against it the wrath of God. Hear the youthful Prince Hamlet, conscious of the vileness of his inconstant mother, as he laments,

Such an act,
That blurs the blush and grace of modesty,
Calls virtue, hypocrite; takes off the rose
From the fine forehead of an innocent love,
And sets a blister there; makes marriage vows
As false as dicer's oaths.
O, shame, where is thy blush!

Never does lasciviousness prosper, whether in degenerate Antony and profligate Cleopatra, or brutish Falstaff, or incestuous Claudius.

With tragic accuracy the inexorableness of the moral law is portrayed in that masterpiece of Shakespeare's, "King Lear." Here are mingled in tragic contrast purest nobility and ignominious baseness, sublimest unselfishness and blackest treachery. Nowhere such awful contrasts as between the aged, lonely Lear—"every inch a king";—Gloster, stalwart, unfailing friend to needy sovereign; Kent, devoted protector of the maddened king; Edmund, treacherous villain; Cordelia, noble, true daughter of the aged monarch; Regan and Goneril, "she-bears" (as one writer has called them), effusive, pretentious, hypocritical, cruel as cutting north wind, bereft of all natural love, impelling their weakened father into the insanity that drives him to the wild, storm-drenched moor. Shakespeare has been criticised for the unhappy outcome of this play and has been accused of gloomy pessimism. Natural

that the two cruel daughters should perish ignominiously by the sword and poison, but that the beauteous angel Cordelia, fairest of all Shakespeare's women, should be permitted to be hanged in prison by order of the wolfish Goneril—this is so much contrary to poetic justice that Tate, toward the end of the seventeenth century, rewrote the conclusion of the play and gave it a happier ending; which version continued for one hundred and sixty years until men began to see that Shakespeare's conviction was true not merely to life but to theology. As Professor Stevenson has written, "This age is one with Shakespeare in its recognition of the law that somehow ties up in one, guilt and folly, and it might be said, ignorance. This day says that man is inevitably bound up in the net of social relations." As Horton states, "The play declares the important moral that villainy is never at a stop, that crimes lead to crimes, and at last terminates in ruins."

That Shakespeare in his easy-going century should have been the advocate of temperance is greatly to be wondered at. No dramatist has more nearly caught the spirit of modern Christianity regarding intemperance. Hear him as he says, "O thou invisible spirit of wine, if thou hast no name to be known by, let us call thee . . . devil. O that men should put an enemy in their mouths to steal away their brains! That we should with joy, revel, pleasure, and applause, transform ourselves into beasts."

What a galaxy of noble women did Shakespeare portray. Indeed, he is preeminently the glorifier of womanhood. He recognizes them, at their normal, as holy and chaste; conservers of the best in life; builders of the beautiful and good; inspirers to nobility and honor in the hearts of men. How winsomely attractive are Rosalind, Portia, Juliet, Olivia, Imogen, Desdemona, Hermione. Does he occasionally delineate a bad woman like Regan or Hamlet's mother or Lady Macbeth? Is it not for the purpose of showing the unnaturalness and infrequency of such characters among womankind and to depict the unspeakable ruin wrought by such as have lost their glory? As Mudge has said, in fitting phrase, "No woman has approached Shakespeare in the purity, sweetness, refinement, and elevation of his feminine characters."

Always does Shakespeare exalt man. In his eyes man is never anything but glorious. Always is he amplifying the Bible statement that man is created in the image and likeness of God. He implicitly believes in humanity's greatness. Never does he value man as does the materialist—a bundle of blind sensibilities and uncontrollable appetites and wild impulses. He does not deny that man may be dethroned through unrighteousness and enslaved by sin, but as philosopher and theologian he acclaims him God's masterpiece. If he depicts an Iago, a Caliban, a Richard III, an Edmund, a Cleon, it is only that against the background of their vices and weaknesses the real man may be made to stand forth transcendent and glorious. "What a piece of work is man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculties! In form and moving how express and admirable, in action how like an angel, in apprehension how like a god, the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals."

Nor was Shakespeare a fatalist. His spiritual intuitions and his superabundant common sense saved him from such a calamity. For some individuals and nations the belief has had a strange fascination, as a certain writer declares. The astrologer, with implicit faith, looked to the heavens to discover what was to be his fate. His horoscope determined his life and destiny. No escape from this. Futile any protest, for the iron laws of necessity could never be broken. Man is helpless in their grip as an atom of dust caught in the driving hurricane. Not for him to carry out his own high purposes and plans according to worthy desire and holy aspiration. His destiny ruled with an arbitrariness against which it was insanity to struggle. By the unbreakable forces of necessity were the events of human experience so held together that man was a slave, not a master. Everything was predetermined. Man is the victim of his circumstances, the prey of superior forces. Indeed, the very gods in whom he foolishly believes either plot against him or are indifferent to his happiness. His deeds have no moral significance, being only mechanical. He thinks and acts as he must. He is a mere automaton—listless, careless, unmoral, irresponsible.

But no greater calamity can come to individual or race than

to live under the thralldom of such a delusion. Still it has persisted, from the time of Sophocles the poet to Haeckel the German materialistic philosopher. But let a nation be shackled by the false creed and its degeneration is inevitable. Permit an individual to hold it, then excuse is found for all kinds of weakness and irregularity; and justification for all varieties of perversity and animality and degradation and excess and sin. The sense of moral responsibility is utterly destroyed. Why should a man struggle against evil tendencies; why battle against degenerate appetencies; why endeavor to enthrone spiritual realities; why believe in the supremacy of the good, if he must believe that a blind, unreasoning, mechanical "fate" is dominant over him? Then all of man's spiritual life is an empty sham, a bold delusion. He is robbed of all ethical significance and degraded to the level of the lifeless machine or the soulless animal.

But Shakespeare will not tolerate the rank heresy. Everywhere he is the preacher of man's moral freedom, his spiritual accountability, his religious responsibility. His evil and his good are his own choice. His character is product of his own desire. Therefore, Shakespeare makes Cassius to say in "Julius Caesar," "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves, that we are underlings." Hear how he makes Edward say in "King Lear," "This is the exultant foppery of the world, that when we are sick in fortune—often the surfeit of our own behavior—we make guilty of our disasters, the sun, the moon, the stars; as if we were villains by necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion and all that we are evil in, by a divine thrusting on." Thus does Shakespeare restore mental sanity to a distraught world. So does he join in the chorus of Christian teachers who make sin a matter of personal choice, a result of the voluntary degradation of the human volition.

The common graces and virtues, so necessary to happiness of life, he nobly extols. He hates hypocrisy, deceit, brutality, indecency, ugliness, cruelty, gluttony. He loved the good, the kind, the unselfish, the generous, the sincere, the pitying, the forgiving, the spiritual. Who does not know and love his exalted eulogy of mercy?

The quality of mercy is not strained;
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath; it is twice blessed;
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes;
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest! It becomes
The throned monarch better than his crown.
His scepter shows the force of temporal power,
The attribute to awe and majesty
Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings.
But mercy is above this scepter'd sway;
It is enthroned in the hearts of kings;
And earthly power doth then show likest God's
When mercy seasons justice.—Consider this
That in the course of justice none of us
Should see salvation; we do pray for mercy;
And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
The deeds of mercy.

And where in all of literature is there a more majestic exponent of the sovereignty of conscience? He believed that in conscience God brooded over the soul for its redemption. To obey it meant benediction and prosperity. To disregard it meant crushing ruin and heavy curse! It is the appeal to conscience that makes "Macbeth" one of the climax productions of all the ages and one of the mightiest contributions toward morality that has ever moved the soul of man. Who can read it without fearing sin with a new and deadly hatred, and without a new sense of the awful seriousness of the deliberate transgression of God's holy law? Picture these three significant personalities: Duncan, king of Scotland, unsuspecting, trustful in the friendship of his once faithful general, Macbeth; Macbeth, with nature changed by hellish ambition into a plotter, then a murderer of his sovereign; Lady Macbeth, bloody as Jezebel, ruthless, ambitious, fired by lust of place and spirit of revenge, nagging her husband into his bloody deed. But what consequences followed the guilty pair, who, having violated the law of God, come under the tragic disapproval of their own accusing souls until life becomes a veritable perdition! Lost forever the prized things which lent joy to their existence. Gone the kingship for Macbeth; present always gloomy remorse whose black pall never lifted; poignant inner pain, excruciating agony of self-condemnation until life itself was a crushing burden. Listen

to the remorseful Macbeth, smitten by his own perfidy, as he says:

Methought I heard a voice cry "Sleep no more."
Macbeth does murder sleep; the innocent sleep,
Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care.
The death of each day's life, sore labor's bath,
Balm of hurt minds, great nature's second course,
Chief nourisher in life's feast.
Macbeth shall sleep no more.

Then he adds:

Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood clean from my hand?
No, this my hand will rather the multitudinous sea incarnadine.

Hear him as he says again:

Had I but died an hour before this chance;
I had lived a blessed time! for from this instant
There's nothing serious in mortality.
All is but toys; renown and grace is dead,
The wine of life is drunk, and the mere lees
Is left this vault to brag of.

Nor does the despicable Lady Macbeth escape. Caught in the fatal grip of a wild insanity induced by the burning recollection of the foul deed she had incited, when she gleefully had clutched in her hands the dagger dripping with Duncan's blood, she cries, as she looks at her hands:

Out, damned spot; out, I say!
Here's the smell of blood still. All the perfume of Arabia will
Not sweeten this little hand! O, O, O!

No help for her in her wild raving, as Macbeth well knows, when he says to the physician called to attend the maniac queen:

Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow;
Raze over the written troubles of the brain;
And with some sweet oblivious antidote,
Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart?

What a climax to the tremendous tragedy, when having heard that the queen had taken her own life, Macbeth cries out, as he

goes to the battlefield, from which Macduff is to bear his head upon a pole:

Out, out, brief candle! Life's but a walking shadow. It is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Nor, in conclusion, can be overlooked regarding the supremacy of conscience that passage wherein the guilty Claudius, uncle to Hamlet, and murderer of the king, ruefully cries:

O, my offense is rank, it smells to heaven.
It hath the primal eldest curse upon it.
A brother's murder! Pray can I not,
Though inclination be sharp as well,
My stronger guilt defeats my strong intent.
What if this cursed hand
Were thicker than itself with brothers' blood,
Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens
To wash it white as snow.

O wretched state!! O, bosom black as death!!
A limed soul, that struggling to be free
Art more engaged!

No greater honor can come to any human being than this, that having dedicated his intellect to God, humanity has thereby been taught to reverence and obey his holy will. This is Shakespeare's supreme distinction. As moralist, he has been humanity's teacher, to the glory of God.

WHO WAS THE SHAKESPEARE OF HOLLAND? AN ESSAY IN COMPARATIVE BIOGRAPHY

DAVIS WASGATT CLARK

Boston, Mass.

SHAKESPEARE: *His mind is the horizon beyond which at present we do not see.*—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

What chiefly differentiates Shakespeare is this (to quote the French critic of English literature), *he attained life*. Emerson also speaks of Shakespeare as a book of life. A slavish quest of either accuracy of statement or beauty of expression usually ends in quenching the spirit and giving us "a body rather than a life":—a tabulation accurate, but dead: specimens spiked on their respective descriptive cards: glass flowers having the color, but lacking that subtle aroma of life which is worth everything else. This is the common end of overstudy.

So study evermore is overshot,
While it doth study to have what it would
It doth forget the things it should.
And when it hath the thing it hunteth most
'Tis won as towns with fire: so won, so lost.

—*Love's Labor's Lost*.

Shakespeare on the contrary, by his intuitive genius, peoples his world with living beings, who fairly breathe and move before the eye. His men and women are realities, not fictions. They hate and love, fear and disdain—in short, every human passion and feeling and every phase and degree of the same is here expressed naturally. It is as if you were not reading but looking and listening. It is this which leads Schlegel to call Shakespeare the master of reality.

He holds the mirror up to
Nature and shows Virtue her own
Feature, scorn her own image and
The very age and body of the time
His form and pressure.

—*Hamlet*.

I set you up a glass
Wherein you may see the inmost part of you. —*Ibid.*

Though Shakespeare thus deals with character he does not caricature. He uses no living models. He never erects a character for the sake of throwing epithets at it. The character shames himself if he is to be shamed and his creator is saved the task. Far from making sport of man's infirmities, which he portrays with invincible fidelity and carries in each instance to its legitimate and unescapable end, one finds oneself sharing the poet's pity of it all. Thus over his work is the "halo of sympathy."

As in the ultimate analysis human nature is one and the same everywhere and in all times, the gift to search out the human heart in one age or land opens every age and land. So Shakespeare is preeminently universal. All lands and times alike are his. Everyone knows Coleridge's characterization—"thousand-souled," sometimes quoted "myriad-minded." Yet as the ocean is one so in his "oceanic mind" there is "multitudinous unity." The source of this unity has already been indicated. It consists in his purpose to express life. So perfectly does he succeed that it matters not what language his works are translated into, his characters express the various human feelings so perfectly that they are recognized at once and each kindles his appropriate emotion in the reader. Shakespeare is perennial as well as universal. It is as if he had an evolution of his own running parallel with that of the human race.

Thus to call a man a Shakespeare is to give him a title of which one may well be proud. Indeed, greater distinction could scarcely be desired. It eclipses glittering and time-honored decorations and high-sounding degrees, though given by eldest seats of learning. In proportion to its size no country in the world boasts a longer list of men who for superlative genius and enduring services to the world might each be called a Shakespeare, than that little country which lies at the mouth of the Rhine like Egypt at the mouth of the Nile.

One remark only before calling this roll. There is no significance in the order taken or in the longer or shorter space devoted to each. The list also is not assumed to be exhaustive. Again, this is not an attempt to relate lives or catalogue works. It is not even an effort to spin a filigree to hold these jewel-lives

together. It is an attempt to show that they stand related by an affinity of their own, strong as it is subtle.

SPINOZA: *Alone! unequaled in his art; exalted above ordinary guilds; without disciples, without citizenship.*—Schleiermacher.

"Spit on that grave! There lies Spinoza!" What a revolution of feeling a hundred years have brought since those words fell from the lips of a minister of religion. Spinoza, too, must needs in his day be cast out of the synagogue and the phrases of his excommunication still emit a sulphurous odor. Religious hatred, as well as some other things, can make strange bedfellows, for in this instance, Christianity and Judaism were at one to consign this "quiet thinker about God" to oblivion. Profane, atheistical, and blasphemous are the terms in which his writings are proscribed. In spite, however, of the determined hostility of organized religion and the odium of popular prejudice, his system has not merely survived, it has proved a magnet, attracting scholars in increasing numbers, until now it admits of question whether it is not the central point of interest in modern philosophy and whether also his answer is not the best yet made to the age-old question, the *summum bonum*, or, as he puts it himself, "Wherein does man's welfare consist and how can it be best attained?"

Long enough before Jefferson had described the inalienable rights of man as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Spinoza had said, "The state has for its end so to act that its citizens should in security develop soul and body and make free use of their reason. The true end of the state is liberty." His thoroughgoing earnestness expresses itself well in the words, "We must neither mourn over things or laugh at them, but understand them." His exactness reflects itself in his saying, "I look at human actions as if I were dealing with lines, surfaces, and bodies." The words have added weight when one remembers that the trade by which he supported himself was that of a lens-maker.

Matthew Arnold has said that those who excommunicated Spinoza remained the "children of Israel," but he became the child of modern Europe. Kuno Fischer has pointed out the debt of Goethe and Lessing to Spinoza, but Schelling, Schleiermacher,

and Hegel are said to be also his debtors, while some have gone so far as to call Spinoza the father of modern thought.

In the ultimate analysis the glory of Spinoza, however, abating nothing of it, is not so much in what he said as in what he was. Whatsoever class name, opprobrious or otherwise, is sought to be attached to him, he was the sincere, unconstrained, diligent thinker and in personal life modest, kind, and pure. He had what is defined as the substance of religion, deliverance from selfishness and devotion to the general. He illustrated the fact that religion does not subsist in metaphysical definitions and propositions, but in a life harmonious with God. With Marcus Aurelius he felt the realness of the divine paternity and with Augustine he found equilibrium in God. Renan says of him that he possessed God-consciousness in a superlative degree and Novalis' familiar but always startling phrase is—"God-intoxicated."

ARMINIUS: *There lived a man whom it was not possible for those who knew him sufficiently to esteem. Those who entertained no esteem for him are such as never knew him well enough to appreciate his merits.*—Peter Bertius.

Three times in the history of the Christian Church the stream of its dogma has, as it were, been locked by one strong personality and finally discharged in new form and channel. The first instance was when Athanasius undertook to define the mode of the divine existence; the resultant was the doctrine of the Trinity. The second was Augustine's attempted definition of human nature and the resultant, in this instance, was the dogmatic affirmation of total depravity. The third epoch was Arminius' definition of the relation subsisting between God and man, resultant upon their variant natures as defined by Athanasius and Augustine. The result was the affirmation of man's personal and essential freedom.

Had Arminius done no more than call a halt to a course of dogmatic and metaphysical reasoning which to those who were pursuing it seemed logically imperative, but which in reality was derogatory to both God and man—making God a "tyrant and executioner" and man at birth so depraved as to be unworthy of God's notice and fit only to "pave hell"—had Arminius only called a halt to all this, as he certainly did, he would have deserved high

praise. But he did not stop with negation. He is constructive. The distinctive feature of his system, as is well known, is the fact that he harmonized as none before him had done the sovereignty of God with the freedom of man. He affirmed on the one hand as opposed to final perseverance the possibility of the believer's fall. On the other hand he affirmed the possibility of a life without sin and the possession of a personal and conscious assurance of acceptance and salvation.

Again, as in the case of Spinoza, Arminius' self is greater than Arminius' system. He showed how to contend earnestly for his faith and yet keep the mind and spirit of the Master. In an age characterized by the asperity both of ignorance and learning and the insults of petulancy, he displayed a phenomenal mildness and forbearance, a uniform candor, courtesy, and dignity.

ERASMUS: *He wrote with a diamond on a golden page.*

As never before or perhaps since, the imperial power and dignity of letters exemplified itself in Erasmus. The cities of Europe greeted him with such public marks of respect as were given to princes. To all intents kings, prelates, and even popes stood in waiting at his door. All factions coveted the prestige of his great name. Perhaps it was to maintain this princely power that he refused to pin himself to either of the great ecclesiastical parties which were dividing Europe. He should be given the benefit of the doubt that he believed he could be more practically serviceable to the Truth if he did not become a partisan. It admits of question, certainly, whether he was not more serviceable by the course which he followed without wavering. However that may be, he could not be coerced either by Rome or Wittenberg. He maintained both his mental equilibrium and moral independence as perhaps not another human being could have done under circumstances similar.

Well deserves he to be recognized as the first man of letters to rise in Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire. Yet with him learning was not to be divorced from current human life. If he revived classical learning and polite studies, he did it not for themselves, but that they might have a positive, immediate, and helpful bearing. Again, his *Praise of Folly*, *Colloquies*, and

Adagia served the purpose of the modern cartoon. Kings, cardinals, popes, and monks felt and winced at his incisive wit. At length he "drove the holy vandals off the stage" and became the rational interpreter of the Scriptures and the founder of a theology which had a wider and, at the same time, a more scientific sweep.

When all is said, however, Erasmus' Greek Testament was probably his greatest contribution to the church and the world. Aside from its intrinsic merit, to even suggest a substitute for the Vulgate, then the Bible of the church, was equivalent to discrediting the church in the world of letters, as later it was to be discredited in the world of science. To show the Latin Bible to be a second-hand and errant text was to destroy the prestige of the clergy at a single blow, for by the Vulgate they stood or fell.

GROTIUS: *The name calls up all that the imagination can conceive of greatness and true fame.*—Bowring.

When Grotius' book on the Law of War and Peace was born an angel band might well have sung again "Peace on earth," for "that classic is believed to have done more good on this planet in promoting national ethics and in fostering the growth of a world conscience than any other work except the Bible." The times were very evil. The Seventy Years' War was being followed by the Thirty Years' War. Europe was one battlefield. Pillage, carnage, rapine were everywhere. Men were degenerating into ferocious beasts. The hour had struck for some dauntless spirit to go in before the monarchs of men and speak to them with authority concerning existing conditions at once so evil and so notorious. This Grotius did with erudition unsurpassed and with cogency irresistible. But he went to his grave feeling, like many another prophet, that he had delivered his burden in vain. So far from being heeded, he was apparently not even heard. Europe remained an armed camp to fill which all arts and crafts were drained. Taxes, want, disease plagued the people.

Two centuries and a half pass by and a scene all the more significant because so belated is witnessed. The first Peace Conference of the world adjourns to lay a silver wreath upon the grave of Grotius and thereby acknowledge that the Peace Conference itself owes its existence to the author of *De jure belli et pacis*.

REMBRANDT: *Art sees the beautiful in all conditions and all times, as did her high priest Rembrandt when he saw picturesque grandeur and noble dignity in the Jews' quarter of Amsterdam and lamented not that its inhabitants were not Greeks.*—Whistler.

Others were the thinkers of Freedom. Rembrandt was the painter of Freedom. He needed no emancipation, for he never wore the fetters of conventionality. No architectural backgrounds are found in his work. Yet the age thought a subject-picture at least could not be painted without them. Religious subjects still ruled the hour, but Rembrandt chose few of them and treated the subjects he chose in such an uneccelesiastical way that one of his Holy Families was once taken for a group of gipsies.

It was to Rembrandt that the title "Shakespeare of Holland" was given. The reason and justness are equally apparent. His portraits stand out from a shadowy and mysterious background like the characters of a Shakespearian play, while his subject-pictures, like for example his *Night Watch*, *Lesson in Anatomy*, and *Joseph Accused*, all have a distinct dramatic action and expression. Again Rembrandt is universal. While not lacking in patriotism, he is more than national. Like Shakespeare, he cannot be dated or localized. If it can be said of Shakespeare that he painted portraits of the passions and that he was a painter of grand pictures of life, it can certainly be said of Rembrandt that he puts characters and dramas upon canvas.

INFERENCE: *Many arrows loosed several ways come to one mark.*—Shakespeare: *King Henry V.*

Contrasts and resemblances abound among this half-dozen men of ever-living renown. The temptation to "match them up" is strong, for it is always a fascinating pursuit and the material in this instance is all in hand. Yet this process is in large measure merely curious and of the nature of diversion. What does it matter, for example, whether the lives of these men were comparatively long or short, whether they had great schooling or little, whether they were precocious or the contrary, whether they were original or borrowers, whether they produced much or little, on many subjects or few, whether they traveled or were home-stayers, whether they were appreciated soon or late, whether they were affluent or

poor, solitary or in families? The question, in this instance, is what is the essential, if there be any, that threads them together?

The essential is that five of these celebrities were born on the soil of Holland and when the superb struggle for civil and religious liberty had come to its victorious close. It is as if into these five lives were by some subtle alchemy transfused the aspirations, tears and sighs, even the very lives sacrificed in the seventy years of struggle. Each is a child of liberty. Spinoza is freedom in philosophy, Arminius in theology, Grotius in civil life, Erasmus in scholarly life, and Rembrandt is freedom in art.

Spinoza's parents came from Portugal to Holland that their son might be born on the freest soil in the world. The son proved himself worthy of both parents and birthplace when, for example, he spurned the attempts to hire him for a price to conform to the synagogue. It is a strange phrase in which Wesley describes Arminius' system of divinity when he calls it "*manly*." Yet Wesley, if anything, is discriminating and happy in his use of words. The same free, courageous manliness characterized both the theologian and his theology. This he showed in his "declaration of his opinions before the Estates of Holland," an act very like Luther's nailing up his Theses although not so spectacular. Grotius, in turn, stood ready and in effect took sentence of imprisonment for life rather than yield his moral and intellectual freedom. Neither a cardinal's hat which he might have worn nor the idolizing devotion of the masses had he espoused their cause, could tempt Erasmus to part with his personal independence in thought, opinion and conduct. Rembrandt's *Night-Watch* is a significant memorial to his unfettered spirit which instead of catering to the petty vanity of those who thought they had bought a conspicuous place on his canvas, idealized the scene and mirrored the heroic spirit of Holland in particular and of the world in general.

The shades of Spinoza, Arminius, Grotius, Erasmus and Rembrandt smile at the swan-song of authority as it expresses itself to-day in the anti-modernist fulminations of the Vatican, but they would be moved to pity if any church which has the theology and is supposed to inherit the spirit of Arminius should seek to limit the privileges of a teacher or a thinker by a plurality of votes.

A PAGE OF POETRY

TO THE MOTHER OF SHAKESPEARE

DID you quite know your bright-eyed, wondering son—
Fashioned by God in some strange, unknown mold—
And stand perplexed before a childhood soul,
As Mary once in far Capernaum?

When he came in from some fond boyhood's play,
And told the pageant of his Stratford town,
The sights and talk of all his happy round,
What made your mother heart so throb that day?

We share with you your baffled mood of heart;
We know the music of our English speech,
We see the canvas of our varied life,
Made clear by magic of your great son's art.

But tell us where to find that certain clue
By which this inner self we may appraise,
And so reveal his soul to our amaze?
With you, we listen and we wonder too.

HARRY PRESSFIELD

AT COCK-CROW

THREE times Truth tapped upon the window-pane,
And thrice she called my name; but false and weak,
Three times I turned my face and would not speak.
"Farewell," said Truth; "I will not come again."
And wert thou TRUTH? and was thy promise vain?
Or why, between my dreaming and the dawn,
Dost come beside my pillow, sad and wan,
To gaze hard-eyed upon my futile pain,
These pallid cheeks, where down the slow tear drips,
This bosom racked with hopeless yearning? So,
A girl might languish for her lover's lips,
Or soldier dying on the field might see
Below his parching lids, deliriously,
In fevered dreams, far-off the waters flow.

ANON.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

PERSONS, OR PROPOSITIONS—WHICH?

A DISTINGUISHED Princeton theologian, lying close to death, was visited by one of his students who tried to comfort him by piously quoting Paul: "I know in whom I have believed." "No," said the dying man, "not *in* whom, but I know *whom*—you must not put a preposition between me and my Lord!" But that Pauline confession of faith contains still deeper suggestions. The apostle says, "I *know* whom I have believed and am *persuaded* that he will keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." There is a difference between knowledge and persuasion, between convictions and opinions, between immediate experience and its intellectual results, between direct perception and logical inference. Christian faith is not primarily a conclusion of the reason but a present reality in the soul.

Christian certitude therefore is of persons and not of propositions. Paul does not say "I know *what*," but "I know *whom* I have believed." Jesus Christ is essential Christianity. He is the final answer to modern agnosticism. For while a metaphysical God may be unknowable and undefinable and therefore seem to make theology as a science impossible, that cannot disturb Christian faith, for it does not have a God who embarrasses the mind with inexplicable problems, but a Divine Man who enthrones God in the heart. Deism, Unitarianism, and much of dogmatic theology must go down before the agnostic objection, but the religion of experience abides. Thought has its limits, doctrines often involve doubts, rational creeds change, but persons abide. So the true Christian is the only scientific agnostic; to him has come the real reverence as he faces the Infinite. He must leave much to faith and trust. To ten thousand questions he dares to answer "I don't know," so long as he can utter the triumphant confession, "I know whom I have believed."

There is a great practical superiority of this personal over an intellectual creed. The latter only touches the mind. The intellect of man is instrumental and not germinal in human life. A man might believe all the creeds—Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian; digest all the Confessions—Augsburg, Westminster, or Helvetian; accept all the Articles of Religion—thirty-nine Anglican or twenty-five Methodist—and yet be unfit to black the boots of the humblest shoemaker who really knows Jesus Christ. For a bad man may be a most eminent theologian. It is said that Rufus Choate used to advise his law students to read books on divinity as the highest source of mental training. Let us hope that it led some of them to be religious, but it is not certain that all of them did. No church council could condemn Satan as a heretic so far as his creed is concerned. As John Wesley said: "It is impossible to imagine that the devil has any erroneous opinions." But the Prince of Evil is a heretic in heart and life.

Saving faith in a Person involves all the faculties. We know persons not only with our heads but with our hearts. No man ever makes his affections the subject of argument. "The heart has reasons of its own of which the reason knows nothing at all." As Tennyson sings:

If ere, when faith had fallen asleep,
I heard a voice, "Believe no more!"
And heard an ever-breaking shore
That tumbled in the godless deep,

A warmth within my heart would melt
The freezing reason's colder part,
And, like a man in wrath, the heart
Stood up and answered, "I have felt!"

Life is greater than logic. We cannot syllogize its sweetest and highest things. Inspiration does more work in the world than argument. Mother's the child's first and enduring creed. Even education at its best is person touching person, for only teaching that is vital has character-forming power. What has done most to make us patriotic? The Constitution or the Declaration? Probably, more than either, the flag—for in its tricolored beauty our country is incarnated.

It is this moral value of a creed which is its highest worth. The mass of folks live more by instinct than by reason. We do not need to know all about a thing to enjoy it. Sometimes enlarged knowledge by suppressing feeling diminishes pleasure. Flowers are more than botany and we do not love them most when we pull them to pieces for analysis. A man's theories may be utterly mistaken and his practice all right. One may not know all about the sun, its size, distance, and the theory of light, and yet bask in its rays and get pleasure and health. The writer of the Nineteenth Psalm could doubtless tell many a modern astronomer things worth while about the heavens. So it is possible for a simple Christian believer to have an apprehension of Christ deeper, broader, and richer than the mere theologian.

The personal creed is unchangeable. We can alter our theology but our personal faith alters us. What we know to-day is quite different from what we knew yesterday, but *Whom* we know is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever. We continually revise our historical confessions, but He does not need to be revised. We hold an intellectual creed, but a personal faith holds us. It transcends all criticism.

Faith in a Person unites, but belief in propositions divides the church. Christians are grouped into sects by *what*, and not by *whom* they believe. Go to your Presbyterian, Baptist, Lutheran, Protestant Episcopalian, or even your Roman Catholic friends and ask, "What do you believe?" and you get statements about grace, foreordination, the sacraments, and ecclesiastical polity utterly bewildering and damnably divisive—but ask any loyal Christian "Whom do you believe?" and there comes the chorus of consenting faith, "We believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God."

It is the heart, and not the brain,
That to the highest doth attain,

and Christian unity will come to the Church of Christ, when all can make their own that passage which Wesley used as his text on "The Catholic Spirit": "Is thy heart right as my heart is with thy heart? . . . If it be, give me thy hand."

The personal creed will help the intellectual creed. This essay is not a denial of the need of doctrines; we should love God with our minds as well as with our hearts. Dogma has a real value. Theology is indeed the queen of the sciences, but, because it is a science, it is subject to growth and change. It does not give life, but helps to conserve life, just as the shell protects the life within the egg. But if the shell never broke we would never get another bird! Doctrine must develop or it will stifle life. But the shell must be broken, not by iconoclastic doubt from without but by the growing life from within. Let Christianity be filled with the glowing warmth of personal religion and its many eggs of guarded truth will constantly be bursting into songsters that fill the air of the world with holy melodies.

A personal creed is the only easy creed to present to doubting minds. Theoretical religion is often a very hard thing; its many propositional beliefs are severe tests of faith and not helps to faith. We do wrong when we chide men for their intellectual doubts, and thrust miracles, prophecies, and dogmas in their faces when we ought to give them Jesus Christ. An orthodox confessional system is a product and not the condition of the sacred life. Persuasion follows knowledge. Theology is an induction from life rather than its source. It becomes easy to believe much about Jesus Christ when we have come to know him. "If any man wills to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." There is no effort either of will or of mind which the soul that has once found him is not willing to make.

If Jesus Christ is a man,
And only a man, I say
That of all mankind I will cleave to him
And to him will cleave alway.

If Jesus Christ is a God,
And the Only God, I swear
I will follow him through heaven and hell,
The earth, the sea, and the air.

So Gilder sang, and it is that personal trust and loyalty which constitutes saving faith. The theory of steam, however well understood, will not carry a man an inch, but trust yourself to the engine

and, however little you know about steam, it will get you to your goal. We are saved not by a faith which is merely mental credence, but by a faith which is a moral act of the will which personally commits to Jesus Christ. How well Hartley Coleridge states it in that well-known stanza :

Think not the faith by which the just can live
Is a dead creed, a map correct of heaven;
Far less a feeling, fond and fugitive,
A thoughtless gift withdrawn as soon as given;
It is an affirmation and an act
That bids eternal truth be present fact.

SAINT PATRICK: THE APOSTLE OF IRELAND

THE story of Saint Patrick as popularly told is full of contradictions and confusions. Gibbon said, "The sixty-six lives of Saint Patrick, which were extant in the ninth century, must have contained as many thousand lies." Yet there are at least two original sources of information as to his life. Both come from his own pen: His *Confession* and the *Epistola ad Coroticum* (Letter to Coroticus). Then there is the *Lureach Phadrig* (Saint Patrick's Loricæ), a hymn or rhythmical prayer, very ancient and generally ascribed to Saint Patrick. Of other than original sources, the most important are the *Ymnus Sancti Patricii*, a hymn in praise of Patrick written during his life by Sechnall, one of his successors in the Irish Episcopate. Another is the Memoir of Bishop Tirechan, written about 670 A. D., and Muirchu's *Life of Saint Patrick*, published before 699 A. D., as it is dedicated to Bishop Aedh, who died in that year. These latter sources must be used with much Higher Criticism, as they are full of myths, legends, and absurd stories.

But Saint Patrick was not a myth. He was a real personage, a true apostle, a zealous missionary, and a flaming evangelist. From the above sources can be gleaned the following information. Saint Patrick was not an Irishman, but a British Celt, born 389 A. D., near Dumbarton, Scotland, the Rock of Clyde, near which there is now a village called Kilpatrick. His father was Cal-

urnius, a deacon, who was the son of Potitus, a presbyter of the British church, which evidently did not at that time require celibacy in its clergy. His Celtic name was Sucat, the full Roman form of his name being probably Patricius Magonus Sucatus.

As the result of an Irish invasion of sheer brigandage, perhaps that led by Niall of the Nine Hostages, the ancestor of the O'Neills, he was taken prisoner at the age of sixteen years, and made a slave to a cruel chieftain in what is now the county of Antrim in northern Ireland. He was in bondage six years when he escaped by ship either to Britain or to Brittany. It was during his captivity that, spending nights in fervent prayer, he had a sound Methodist conversion. Like Paul, he not only received the witness of the Spirit but a missionary call.

He acknowledges his illiteracy. It is quite uncertain where he spent the years of his training. It seems likely that it was in Gaul, under the tutelage of Germanus of Auxerre. He did not become a great scholar, but he did master the Scriptures. No writer quotes the Bible more freely or with greater religious insight. In the less than seven thousand words of his *Confession* there are one hundred and thirty biblical references, and in the two thousand words of the *Epistle* there are over fifty. Among the many convincing proofs of the genuineness of the *Confession* and the *Epistle* is the fact that his scriptural quotations are made from the text that was current at the beginning of the fifth century, principally from the Old Latin Version; some, however, were from the Vulgate of Saint Jerome, which was published in the last decade of the fourth century. Coroticus, to whose martyred subjects the *Letter* was addressed, ruled in northern Britain some time after 420 A. D., at Al-Clyde, near which Patrick was born.

At last, as to Paul at Troas, there came the specific missionary call. An angel named Victorius (a name probably to be identified with one of his dead and glorified friends) appears as the Voice of the Irish calling: "We pray thee, holy youth, to come and walk with us." Out of the bosom of the night comes the bitter cry of a people, sunk in Druidic superstition, with their sorcery and human sacrifices. Through the Emerald Isle he moved, swift, and as genial and persuasive as the sunbeam. He meets their

tricky magicians as mightily as Moses did those of Egypt. While he did not convert Laogaire, of Tara, Head King of Ireland, he conquered his opposition and won a free highway for the gospel.

Christianity had already entered Ireland. Saint Palladius was its first bishop. But Patrick gathered together its scattered fragments and gave it organic form as well as spiritual life. There is not the slightest historic proof for the medieval myth that Patrick went to Rome and was commissioned by Pope Celestine. All the ancient evidence is against it. The earliest historians do not mention it. Patrick himself, like Saint Paul, claims divine authority and says in the *Letter*, "I am a bishop, appointed by God, for Ireland." When he uses the word *Romani*, Romans, as he does twice, he does not mean the Roman Church, but the church as associated with the Roman Empire as it had been for more than a hundred years since Constantine. The Bishop of Rome was given at that time special respect as occupying the See at the Imperial City of the Western Empire, but nowhere was there recognition of his Divine Vicegerency. Early Irish Christianity, as we see it in the writings of Saint Patrick, is almost identical with the primitive Christianity of the New Testament.

Very ridiculous, but rather amusing, are the later legends. The Saint Patrick of the legend was a clever magician, turning ugly men into Adonises and dwarfs into giants. By baptizing pork, he made it fit fish for Friday. He turned poisoned cheese into stone. And then he marshaled all the reptiles of Erin and drove them from that cliff called Cruach Phadruig into the sea.

He gave the frogs and snakes a twist
And banished them forever.

Possibly there is implied an abolition of some form of ophiolatry, or Serpent Worship. Yet Ireland has few reptiles—simply because the deep seas and channels between it and the continent made difficult the distribution of animals that could not swim or wade so far. More beautiful is the tale of men and angels joining in a twelve days' wake of sacred song at his funeral in 461 A. D. Doubtless they did, even if the human choristers could not hear the heavenly songsters!

He had high apostolic qualifications. Like Wesley he was a practical mystic. He utilized the tribal bond of Celtic clan-life in his work. He had a commanding presence and oratorical power. In preaching he possessed the gift both of illustration and application; a famous example is his use of the trefoiled shamrock to picture the Trinity in Unity. He attacked with his message the centers of influence in the Green Isle. He established schools and made medieval Ireland the beacon light of culture for all the Western World. He imparted to the Irish church his own missionary zeal; a generation later, Columba, a son of the royal O'Neills, went to the Hebrides and conquered for the Christ those islands and northern Scotland. Self-sacrifice, enthusiasm, holiness, courage, and a natural ability which compensated his lack of culture—these were among the gifts of this primitive Methodist, far more Methodist than Romanist!

His name still diffuses fragrance; it has a magic spell, fresh as the shamrock, green as the emerald. But nothing is more tragic than Irish history. Most independent of Rome of all medieval churches, at last the only English Pope, Nicholas Brakespear, Adrian IV, sold Ireland to Henry II of England. The greatest leaders of Irish liberty have been Protestants, such as Robert Emmett and Charles Stewart Parnell. If the present Ireland is to win back her primitive and medieval glory, retune her harp and restore the unclouded sunburst of her hope, it will be because to this time of political peril another Saint Patrick has come preaching a pure gospel and expressing it in the practical idealism of a Wesley.

Many devout Hibernians still repeat at bedtime the *Lorica*, or Breast-plate of Saint Patrick. It is even more wholesome for the soul than Coué's autosuggestive word-charm for the body. Here is a free rendering:

SAINT PATRICK'S ARMOR

I

I bind to myself to-day
The strong power of the invocation of the Trinity,
The faith in the Trinity in unity,
The creator of the elements.

II

I bind to myself to-day
The power of the incarnation of Christ with that of his baptism,
The power of his crucifixion with that of his burial,
The power of his resurrection with that of his ascension,
The power of his coming to the sentence of judgment.

III

I bind to myself to-day
The power of the love of seraphim,
In the obedience of angels,
In the hope of resurrection to reward,
In the prayers of the holy fathers,
In the predictions of the prophets,
In the preaching of the apostles,
In the faith of confessors,
In the purity of holy virgins,
In the acts of righteous men.

IV

I bind to myself to-day
The power of heaven,
The light of the sun,
The whiteness of snow,
The force of fire,
The flashing of lightning,
The velocity of wind,
The depth of the sea,
The stability of the earth,
The hardness of rocks.

V

I bind to myself to-day
The Power of God to guide me,
The might of God to uphold me,
The wisdom of God to teach me,
The eye of God to watch over me,
The ear of God to hear me,
The word of God to give me speech,
The hand of God to protect me,
The way of God to be before me,
The shield of God to shelter me,
The Host of God to defend me.

VI

Against the snares of demons,
Against the temptations of vices,

Against the lusts of nature,
Against every man who meditates injury to me;
Whether far or near, with few or many,
I have set round me all these powers
Against any hostile savage power
Directed against my body or my soul,
Against the incantations of false prophets,
Against the black laws of heathenism,
Against the false laws of heresy,
Against the deceit of idolatry,
Against the spells of women, of smiths, and druids,
Against all knowledge that blinds the hearts of man.

VII

Christ protect me to-day
Against prison, against burning,
Against drowning, against wrongdoing,
That I may receive abundant reward.

VIII

Christ with me, Christ before me,
Christ behind me, Christ within me,
Christ beneath me, Christ above me,
Christ at my right hand, Christ at my left,
Christ in chariot (when I travel),
Christ in the ship (when I sail).

IX

Christ in the heart of every man who thinks of me,
Christ in the mouth of every man who speaks to me,
Christ in every eye that sees me,
Christ in every ear that hears me.

X

Of the Lord is Salvation, Christ is Salvation;
With us ever be thy salvation, O Lord! AMEN.

THE STARRY CROWN

PAUL, in the first letter he wrote, that to the church at Thessalonica, tells his converts that they will be his "hope, joy, and crown of rejoicing in the presence of the Lord Jesus at his coming." In other words, he expects to find his highest reward in the salvation of others. Heaven is often conceived by us as a pretty

place, described in the Book of Revelation or by John Milton, but such a heaven is hardly real enough to dry our tears. But a heaven made up of folks we have helped to get there is not only blessedly human, but also one in which the divine glory becomes truly our own.

The apostle was not deeply concerned about his own experience. That was behind him on the Damascus road. His only thought was for others. It is a glorious thing to be enough saved for that. It would brighten any man's religious experience to forget his own salvation a bit in the business of soul-winning.

He expected to know them in the resurrection life. Death does not destroy identity, for that would be the end of personality. The very continuity of spiritual survival lies in memory. Real reward depends on continuous personal consciousness. So the souls we have led to Christ will unite to honor and crown the faithful worker. Probably Paul has found, in the many centuries since he wrote these words, myriads of souls whom his preaching and writings started on the heavenly road and of whom he knew nothing in his earthly life. And so may we.

Man is a personal force in the world, put here to subdue the earth, to transform its deserts into gardens and to place the girdle of manhood about all created things. But not on material nature, but on the living stones of human character is carved his supreme artistry. God uses man to save man. The luscious clusters of redeemed life grow, not on the Vine which is Christ, but on the branches which are Christians.

The Bible pictures the joy of God in creation, singing his refrain, "It is very good," at the close of each cosmic day. The painter's real reward is the picture, the poet's best pay is his poem. So our highest happiness here is beholding the new day dawn upon a darkened soul and heaven's sunlight banish sorrow's shadow from the sinful face. And the best thing we shall get in heaven will be, not a golden harp on which to play, but the greeting songs of those we helped to get there; not a gem-studded crown, but the gathered jewels of redeemed spirits.

This is to "enter into the joy of the Lord," to share his passion of sacrificial service and his rapture of redeeming love. The crown

is taken "in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming." And Jesus will not be jealous. The comrades of the cross shall share the glory of their King.

Here is an allegory: A great king possessed a princely diadem, flashing with transparent diamonds, purple amethysts, sky-blue sapphires, verdant emeralds, and blood-red rubies. A thief stole the crown, despoiled it of its glittering gems, and scattered them far and wide over the world. The king sent forth his servants to recover the lost jewels. They brought them back one by one, rescued from every clime and country of the earth. And then the sovereign said to his servants: "The gems you have recovered are yours for the finding. Not on my brow alone but on yours shall shine forever the starry beauty of the precious stones saved by you from the spoiler's hands." Can you interpret the parable?

"Will there be any stars in *my* crown?"

THE HOUSE OF THE INTERPRETER

NEHEMIAH is a noble example of a lay preacher, a combination of religious enthusiasm and practical efficiency. In him there meet lofty idealism, political skill, and business energy. He achieved what Ezra planned in the establishment of the Jewish commonwealth. His book is full of sermon suggestions that have value for to-day. Only three abstracts are given here.

THE PRAYER OF A PIOUS PATRIOT

The religious life has proved its power to thrive in the most unfavorable environments. Paul found "saints in Caesar's household," in the very shadow of a tyrant's throne. So in the splendid palace of Artaxerxes in the City of Lilies Nehemiah kept a clean conscience amid the corruptions of a court. Piety is an exotic anywhere in this wicked world, but the soul can make its own climate by prayer. And, even so, this cupbearer of the King of Persia, surrounded by the perilous perfumes of royal favor, kept his religious life sweet and sound by perpetual baths in the fragrant atmosphere of heavenly inspiration. Not unlikely it was his piety which made him a favorite. Necessity compels kings and rulers to trust the godly man. The worldly man wants his wife to be religious; the speculative banker seeks honest employees; and the blasphemer desires a godly teacher for his children. Sinful society pays at last a grudging homage to goodness. Circumstances are no excuse for backsliding. Any station that encloses a duty is a safe place for a saint, but only a positive piety can stand the test. (Nehemiah 1.)

Nehemiah was patriotic as well as pious. Exile had not dimmed his

devotion to his native land. Persian magnificence had not made dilapidated Zion less dear. It is a spurious spirituality that would keep the pious man out of politics. There may be as true religious fervor shown in building walls as in saving souls, for the condition of a nation's walls may profoundly affect the condition of souls. It is necessary and right to fight typhoid in the blood of the sick man; it is quite as important to purify the water and milk supply. The state of the church and the state of the state have much to do with each other. A manly faith finds its field of activity everywhere. The highest worship of God may be found in the lowly service of man. In our American life we need men who can blend the flag and the cross, our country and Christ in a single passion of loyalty and service. Our Christianity is denied when it is not applied.

Nehemiah had a social conscience. To him to be saved was more than the achievement of personal rectitude. His was a vicarious passion which made his people's sins and woes his own. So when his kinsman Hanani brings bad news from home of the reproach and ruin of his native land, his heart breaks at the cry of humanity, brotherhood, and fatherland, and it is to him the call of God for sacrificial service. If Jerusalem is defenseless and dishonored, he feels the shame as a stain on his own conscience and a burden upon his own soul. The grief of the patriot leads to the self-surrender of the saint. His prayer is a marvelous expression of this identification of himself with the sin and sorrow of his race. As Mr. Spurgeon says, "he spelled 'we' with an 'I' in it." "I confess the sins of the children of Israel which we have sinned against thee." We shall never be true helpers of humanity until we take to heart all human sin and suffering. This is the verdict of great souls; all lofty lives have the cross-bearing spirit. Self-preservation may be the first law of nature, but self-sacrifice is the first law of grace. As our Lord wept over the city, and through his tears saw the path to Calvary, so must his disciples become partners of his passion and pain if the world is to be redeemed.

Nehemiah was a model layman. He does not stop to criticize Ezra, the ecclesiastic, under whose leadership things have come to such a pass; he does not try to shift the burden from his own shoulders upon those of the priests; he does not even quiet his conscience by making a subscription toward restoration of the walls. He flings himself, his splendid talents, his substance, his position, into the breach of broken walls and shattered national hopes. An intensely emotional nature, he nevertheless does not waste the substance of his soul in passion. His sorrow drives him to God. Prayer, persistent and penitent prayer, is the solvent of his difficulty, the source of strength, and the prelude to action. His prayer unites the humility of utter contrition with the audacity of a militant faith. He dares to remind God of his pledged word and challenges the honor of the Eternal. It is the prayer of a practical business man, who knows that the path to his purpose must lie through the favor of his royal master. He gets at the heart of the king of Persia through the might of the King of kings.

To-day many of the walls that once safeguarded the nation's life are

being broken down, the walls of the Lord's Day, family religion, and public reverence. Is there no call to the men of America, out of the sepulchers of our sires, to rebuild these broken bulwarks of social safety? Every town and city needs its Nehemiah, whose loyal love to state and church shall seek strength through prayer for militant service.

CONSECRATED COURAGE OR COWARDLY COMPROMISE

"I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down;" such is the daring defiance with which Nehemiah meets the counsel of compromise suggested by the allied conspirators against his pious and patriotic enterprise. For, having failed to frustrate his plans by force, they resort to fraud. This is the most successful strategy of Satan; if he can only induce good people to call a truce and consent to a parley he has half won the day. It is such a cunning appeal to the generosity of noble souls which constitutes the most dangerous "confidence game" played by the plausible defenders of "vested rights against the righteousness of real reform." "We have really misunderstood one another; we all seek the same ends, let us find some neutral ground on which we can come together and talk it all over. We don't want the saloon back nor to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment. Just let us have our wine and beer and we will let it stand!" Christian charity is a beautiful thing, but we dare not let it degenerate into a good-natured tolerance of the poor second best which would usurp the place of the ideal good. (Neh. 6. 1-12.)

Nothing can save the true man from the temptation of such temporizing trickery but to keep his eye on the alluring glory of the heights. He will not leave the holy hill of Zion for a pleasant visit yonder to the plains of Ono; he will not let the devil pick the field for fighting God's battle. To work for God, to work with God, that is a great work to be put in the forefront of all work. The selfish claims of secular business, the allurements of pleasure, the winsome wooing of the world all cry, "Come down!" but he who has caught the vision of the city of God and felt the consecrated claims of the Kingdom must reply, "Why should the work cease while I leave it and come down unto you?"

Whoso has felt the vision of the Highest
 Cannot confound nor doubt him nor deny;
 Yea, with one voice, O world, though thou deniest,
 Stand thou on that side, for on this am I.

But the policy of his foes goes farther than a mere proposition for a parley; Sanballat, Tobiah, and company try a sort of moral blackmail. They tell the patriot builder and reformer that his motives are liable to be suspected, that he may have to meet a charge of treason made to his royal master, the Persian King. And they quote high authority for the infamous slander, "Gashmu saith it." This Arabian emir seems to have been a sort of glorified gossip, a clever, conceited, and influential master in an ancient "school for scandal." Such men still poison the air with unscrupulous calumny; they are robbers who steal reputation, they are murderers who stab character. No lofty-souled leader of men has ever

been able to wholly escape this peril. The path of duty which leads to heavenly glory often passes near the pitfall of earthly infamy. But if we are to achieve anything worth while we must be deaf to the whispers of Mrs. Grundy or the noisy clamor of popular abuse, and open our ears to the music of divine approval.

Shall I to soothe the unholy throng
Soften the truth, and smooth my tongue?
Yea, let men rage, since thou wilt spread
Thy shadowing wings around my head.

There is a panic of popularity, a cowardice of custom, a petty politroonery of public opinion against which the only defense is the courage of a clean conscience.

These, however, were but clumsy snares compared with the damnable subtlety of their final attempt to seduce Nehemiah from his consecrated purpose. They pollute the purity of divine revelation by suborning the voice of prophecy. A messenger of Jehovah is induced by bribery to break down the brave man's resolution by a craven counsel of terror. Shemaiah, an acknowledged prophet, advises that together they take refuge in the temple against the dreaded hand of the assassin. The masterpiece of the king of darkness is to imbue the holy ministry with a temporizing policy of despair and delay. Some preachers are only diplomats of the devil. A time-serving pulpit would make the house of God a coward's castle, in which the hosts of God hide away from the strenuous peril of militant service. If only good people can be driven from the fields of politics, society, and trade into the church, and kept there, the devil has won a signal victory. The primary election may be more important than the prayer meeting. The walls of the redeemed society must be built, not merely around the sanctuary but about the whole city, so that they shall enclose the market place, the public office, and the election booth as well as the altar.

It is worth while to note that this trained courtier from the court at Susa was able to meet and thwart the chicanery of his opponents. Good men need not be stupid. When the wisdom of the serpent is sanctified by inspiration of the Holy Dove it becomes a sacred weapon, a spear of Ithuriel whose revealing touch dissolves the specious deceits behind which iniquity hides the foulness of its face. This does not imply any taint of insincerity in the pious policy of using a sanctified strategy in the cause of righteousness. It simply means that a clean heart makes a clear eye, and that the utter frankness of a conscientious courage will confuse the sophistry of sin and the subtlety of Satan. A faltering prudence is not always even politic, and valor may very often be the true discretion and the very secret of safety. There is more than a sublime self-appeal in the fine phrase of Nehemiah, "Should such a man as I flee?" It is rather the conscious greatness of a soul allied to a great God and given to a great task. To "come down" for cowardly compromise with the enemies of God would be more than a physical descent from the Judean mountains; it would be a coming down from the heights of character and the splendor

of a lofty spiritual service. In the glory of that vision was born the consecration and courage that made his soul stately and strong.

THE SOUL'S SORROW AND THE JOY OF JEHOVAH

At last, under the patriotic leadership of Nehemiah, the breaches in the wall of Zion have been repaired and the house of God renovated. These visible defenses, necessary as they are, are not the sole nor the chief safeguard of the nation's life. So long as sin is in the city, it will throw down the walls and give entrance to the enemy. The reformer and builder must give way to the teacher, the man of action to the man of thought. Nehemiah, the secular leader, can inspire the masonry of granite walls, but Ezra, the minister of religion, erects the invisible but mightier bulwark of the law of God about the life of the people. The mechanical must make way for the moral.

The ancient covenant of Sinai, the Deuteronomic law that inspired the reform under Josiah and the sacerdotal liturgy elaborated by priestly prophets such as Ezekiel, have been at last codified into the great book of instruction, rightly ascribed to Moses because filled with the spirit and developing the ideals of the great lawgiver. The Book of the Law is no longer an esoteric code for a sacerdotal class; it is more than a priestly ritual; it is henceforth the people's book to be taught in popular assemblies. Israel first taught democracy in religion. (Neh. 8. 1-12.)

The scene is striking; it is something like a vast Sunday school, with mixed classes of adults and children, each with its Levitical instructor. Ezra, the superintendent, occupies the platform, with his fourteen assistants. It is not in the temple area; the message of Jehovah has come out of the "dim religious light" of the holy places into the broad daylight of the open street. It is a symbol that the synagogue is to supersede the sanctuary, that the priest and the altar must finally yield to the preacher and the pulpit. Scripture shall be no sealed book to the common man; its teachers are to so give the sense that the will of Jehovah shall pass from the written page to the heart of the worshiper. And Israel learned the lesson; the first and the one hundred and nineteenth psalms are the expression in rapturous song of the new-found delight in the statutes of the Lord.

Knowledge of the book of God is the signal for religious awakening. The vision of the divine ideal is at once despair and hope. Its holiness convicts the sinful soul; its divinity inspires confidence in believing hearts. So, when the multitude hears for the first time the message of Sinai, the warnings of Deuteronomy, and the exactions of the law of holiness, waves of feeling sweep over the assembly, arousing mingled moods of sorrow and joy. "By the law is the knowledge of sin," and in the light of the new vision of the revealed will of Jehovah the rebellions and disloyalties of the nation stand revealed in dreadful distinctness. In the holy mirror of law, human sin is seen in all its hideous deformity. The fountains of feeling gush forth in the "godly sorrow that worketh repentance."

Sorrow for sin is in the road to the joy of salvation. For, after all, this great meeting had not been called for a fast, but for a feast. The terrors of the law are only the reverse side of the glory of the gospel; the warnings are only shadows of the promises. So Ezra speaks words of consolation to the weeping people, "This day is holy unto Jehovah your God; mourn not nor weep, for the joy of Jehovah is your strength." The minor strain of spiritual anguish is resolved into the major melody of exultant gladness. Sorrow is a good thing, but joy is better; for while sorrow spurs the soul to penitence, joy wings the life for service. And so the people held a holy picnic, an ancient camp meeting, weaving their tents of olive boughs with their message of peace, pine branches with their aromatic fragrance typical of healing and waving palms symbolic of victory. In their rejoicing self was swallowed up in the passion for service, and abundance shared its fullness with need. The law, through the enthusiasm and inspiration of joy, found fulfillment in love.

The joy that gives strength is a divine joy; it is called "the joy of Jehovah." For pain and rapture meet in the life of God. He, too, feels anguish for the broken law as he sees it in the broken lives of his children, and he, bearing the burden of the world's agony in atoning love, touches the blessedness of divinest joy through sacrificial service, when he sees of the travail of his soul and is satisfied. When we learn to share his heartbreak over a lost world and lost souls we too shall have entered into the joy of our Lord.

THE ARENA

A PROMINENT DIVINE ON CHRIST¹

AN able article on Christ by an eminent Methodist theologian is so striking as to be worthy of a remark or two. He says that Christ's temptations involve a "degree of interest in alternatives." Yes, interest to look at them, see their meaning, but not interest in the sense of wanting to take the wrong alternative, not because he physically could not, but because he morally would not. This interest in alternatives, it is said, means in Christ "a certain mental obscurity." But how can "comprehension of alternatives and interest in them" mean mental obscurity? It would mean exactly the opposite. This comprehension and interest also "means a certain hesitation of will." But the record shows no hesitation of will as to any moral or religious alternative, except one—the death on the cross. But that was due to the very opposite of mental obscurity, because he saw too clearly what that death meant. "Where that obscurity and hesitation was the case, there was certainly no omniscience." But if there was no mental obscurity nor hesitation of will, why should there not be omniscience, so far as it was possible in a divine-human person? The records show that Christ was (or became) morally omniscient,

¹ See the article on "The Problem of the Person of Christ" by Professor Edwin Lewis in the January-February issue of the *METHODIST REVIEW*.

omniscient for all the needs of his work (the only being of whom this was true), but not absolutely omniscient (Mat. 24. 36).

"It is difficult to see why, if supernatural birth did not of itself assure omniscience, it should yet be held to assure holiness." But the records show that it (or something else) did assure moral omniscience. In any case the apodosis does not follow. For holiness is a moral attribute germane to man, while omniscience in absolute sense is germane to God alone. Supernatural birth would therefore inevitably secure holiness (like produces like) until thwarted by an act of will.

Absence of human paternity of Jesus is called "so debatable a point." But it is debatable, not on the records, which leave no doubt, but on presuppositions alone. It is "in keeping with modern modes of thought to believe that God prepared for the coming of his Son not by dispensing with fatherhood, but by divinizing motherhood." This may or may not be true, but in any case "modern modes of thought" should conform to facts. Philosophically if the Son had an actual preexistence with God, supernatural birth (without father) seems the only way he could come; historically the records show he did come that way. Of course the divinizing of motherhood goes without saying.

Luke leaves on the mind "very serious doubt whether he is describing an absolutely virgin birth." On the contrary there can be no serious doubt. (1) No one doubts the human paternity of Elizabeth's son, though he was to be "filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb." (2) Mary is told of the birth of a son who was to be called "the Son of the Most High." Mary questions, inasmuch "as I know not a man." Then she is assured not, as would be the case on supposition of those denying supernatural birth, that she would yet know a man and therefore need not doubt, but that "the Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee." As though he said, "Do not fear, Mary, the Spirit takes the place of thy betrothed man." (3) This explains and guarantees the divine result, as he adds: "Wherefore that holy begotten (thing or being) shall be called the Son of God." I do not see how a miraculous (non-paternal) birth could be announced more distinctly, unless the announcer used words with a frankness and grossness not in keeping with the spiritual beauty if not splendor of this wonderful narrative. Far from it being true, therefore, that "it can never be certain that Luke describes a virgin birth" it is morally certain that he does.

What Luke really teaches is that the Spirit "made Mary so feel the glory of her approaching motherhood, and filled her mind with such rapturous thoughts concerning her child," that it was in a real sense supernaturally born. But it does not follow that a child is supernaturally born because the Spirit so "possesses" the mother that her "mind is filled with such solemn and rapturous thoughts concerning her child and its destiny." On the contrary, that has been the experience of thousands of mothers, and perhaps ought to be the experience of all. And thousands of children have justified it, and yet not one of them has been a Christ.

This new theory of a preparation of Mary is said to be no less "congruous with a Christian philosophy of the universe." Well, it is if you make

your philosophy not out of the facts but out of your own presuppositions. The fact that never in the history of the world has the divinest possible "preparation of the mother's heart and mind" ever produced a Jesus Christ, while the miraculous birth as told in the records did produce him, ought to be dovetailed into a "Christian philosophy of the universe," where the emphasis is on the word Christian. For the same reason the natural birth with the religious preparation of the mother cannot "account for his uniqueness, his universality, and his preexistence."

Jesus was born Jesus, not the Christ, though he was born to become the Christ, as what "Jesus" stands for is separable in thought from what "the Christ" stands for. Well, of course that is true in the sense that the words mean different things, "Jesus a Saviour," and "Christ," an Anointed One. But there was only one person born, and when he was a child he was only potentially either Jesus (Saviour) or Christ (Messiah), but when he was a man he became both in the same sense. Nor does the prologue of John make the modern distinction between Jesus the man and Christ the Son of God. Just the contrary. There was only one being for John—the being who "became flesh," the being who "cometh after" John the Baptist, but "is become before" him "because he was" before him. And this one Jesus is called the Logos by John the evangelist because he was the Logos. Nor is there the slightest evidence in the New Testament nor in the consciousness of Jesus that "he became anointed with the Logos." He did indeed become "identified" with the Logos, but that was not only a very early evolution, but it was as inevitable as his identification with Saviour, Redeemer, Son of Man, Son of God, and it stands or falls with these.

"We owe the coming of Jesus not to any arbitrary dispensing with a human factor, but to the unusual activity of the divine." Nobly said. No divine deed is ever "arbitrary," much less the Gospel miracles. And it is that every Gospel which shows that the coming of Jesus was due to an "activity of the divine" so glorious that its very glory was the dispensing with one human factor, not as arbitrary but as fitting morally, æsthetically, historically, and besides as absolutely indispensable. Not only is our "deep-seated sense of order" not violated, but it is glorified. The other hypothesis would need a series of stupendous miracles less rational than this one of the records.

This able writer's conception of Christ is that he was a man only, born by a human father of a spiritually wonderfully endowed mother, who was "true to his vocation," this vocation being to make "absolute expression in a human life" of that "integral feature" of God which we might call the "eternal Christ." That was the achievement of Jesus. He brought himself into an "essential moral identity" with God. In this sense he at last became "very God." But this republication of the dynamistic Monarchian Theodotus's views (190-210 A. D.) slightly modified, does not, I fear, help us much. (1) For a man to become "very God" is as philosophically absurd as it is impossible in the nature of things. (2) For Jesus to "realize absolute God consciousness" without being God, is also philosophically impossible, for every being is what his consciousness is.

(3) For a man to "enter wholly into the innermost meaning of God and his purpose" without being God is impossible, for the "innermost meaning of God" is God. No one has looked or can look into that abyss but God. The sacred writer had a finer apprehension, did he not? "No man hath seen God at any time; God only begotten [Harnack follows Hort in thinking—according to many very ancient authorities—that this is the true reading (see *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, 541-6)], who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." (4) No man can have an "absolute involution of the divine" in him, nor "identity of experience" with God, nor an "identity of will" with God, unless he is God. For that involution, experience, will—that is just God. If Jesus perfectly had God's experiences then he was God. (5) Jesus "achieved" salvation, redemption, etc., but he did not and in the nature of things could not "achieve" Deity. God is not made, nor attained unto, though we can attain unto more of his likeness.

The Logos which is the basis of the "absolute God consciousness of Jesus," it is said, is also the "basis of human personality." There is a sense in which this is true. The Father from eternity has seen all men in his Son, who is the "first-born among many brethren." We might say that because God is the eternal Father of the Son he can become in his own time the Father of all men. That is one of the meanings of the incarnation. And because God is a person, he can make persons, and they as such are therefore his children. But that does not mean that the Logos is the basis of our personality, as in Jesus. What is the basis of our personality, as of all gods and angels? Consciousness. Does that affirm an eternal Logos in us, or that we are that Logos? No. It affirms only that we are human beings, no more, no less, sinning, striving, etc. What did Christ's consciousness affirm? That he was a human being too, but more, without a sense of sin, without a sense of even imperfection, failure or defect, that he was the Son of God, that therefore he alone knew the Father, and the Father alone knew him, that he dwelt in the bosom of the Father constantly, or that in other words the Logos which he was is quite different from the light of the Logos which shines forth, enlightening every man who cometh into the world. Christ is universal because he is man and because he can make us to become in our own measure sons of God.

Finally it is said that Christ was "preexistent only in the sense that every other man is," because every man is a "manifestation of a certain antecedent divine reality." There is a slight confusion in our author. On one page Jesus cannot be identified with the Logos, but on another the Logos is the basis of the absolute God consciousness of Jesus; on one page men have vainly endeavored to identify him with the Logos, on another he has really identity of experience with God himself and therefore an absolute God consciousness. Both cannot be true. The trouble is that Jesus appears in our records as "that mother's child" and as the Son of God, as a man who was born at Bethlehem and as he who could say, Before Abraham was I am. I think few claim that Christ's consciousness (either in heaven or earth) was that of being "absolutely divine and

eternal in *its own native right*" (*italics mine*), at least none who are trained in the New Testament and early Christian thought; but all who are trained in those sources claim or could rightly claim that the Son's consciousness is and always was of being divine and eternal as *Son*, and therefore dependent not on himself or his own right but on the Father. That consciousness not only does not "lack any known facts to support it," but all the facts of the New Testament, of history, and—in its own way—of Christian experience, support it: that that mother's child was at once son of man and Son of God. Not only is the New Testament *not* "susceptible of a different interpretation," according to scientific exegesis, but candid Unitarians and German rationalists have confessed that that Testament teaches that very thing, and therefore they reject it as authoritative. The reasons why God "could" not "have done at any earlier time what he at last did in Christ" are historical purely. That our Lord's preexistence was simply a certain "feature" of the Father, say love or grace or truth, or that the Father himself was finally seized hold of by the natural though illegitimate son of a spiritually endowed woman, breaks down on Jesus' consciousness and our sources: these represent not a "*this*" or a "*somewhat*," but a "*he*," a "*him*" ("lovedst me before the foundation of the world"), not a person or individual in our sense, but a Person, a Subsistence, the eternal Son, who dwelt in God and with God, and who in the fullness of time "for us men and our salvation" was incarnated in the womb of the virgin Mary and born on that first Christmas day.

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

Madison, N. J.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH

NEW PATHS IN THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE

THE modern man is a man who thinks historically; and for this reason modern science also knows no higher aim than to acquire an historical picture, in so far as it is concerned with the past. The first task, consequently, in the scientific study of the Old Testament is to set forth the history of Israelitic literature, with a view to attaining in this way the ultimate goal of a history of Israelitic religion and culture.

But the literature of the Israelitic people contains only a single book. There are, it is true, outside of the Old Testament a few literary monuments, such as the Siloam Inscription dating from the time of Hezekiah and the agricultural "calendar" of Gezer dating from 800-600 B. C. But these do not belong to literature in the proper sense of the term. The question, therefore, naturally arises as to whether it is possible to write a history of Israelitic literature on the basis of a single book.

The Old Testament, however, is only apparently a unit. Actually it falls apart into separate writings that even yet are wholly independent of each other. It contains, in fact, a little library. The individual books

gathered together in it date from different centuries, in round numbers from the first thousand years before Christ. They furnish, therefore, some basis for a history of Israelitic literature; and this ideal we may hold before us, even though the prospect of its attainment may be doubtful.

But as soon as we look beyond Israel to the Judaism of the Persian-Hellenistic period, the material at our disposal suddenly expands to about double the extent of the Old Testament. For now that whole literature is added, which is contained in the Pseudepigrapha and the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, and which is being constantly enriched by new discoveries. One need only recall the Achikar-Romance in the Elephantine papyri of the fifth century *a. c.*, and the Damascus-Document found in the synagogue of Old Cairo, whose contents date from the second century *a. c.*

Such is the extent of the material available for the history of Israelitic-Jewish literature. It is, we shall have to admit, quite scanty; but it is nevertheless not without promise of being successfully used for the purpose in hand. Of decisive significance in this connection is the question as to whether it is possible to make up what is lacking in the *extent* of the traditional material by the *intensity* of scientific study. In three different ways scholars are at present working toward the desired goal: (1) by means of literary criticism; (2) by tracing the history of literary forms, and (3) by unfolding the history of literary material.

1. LITERARY CRITICISM

Concerning literary criticism a few words will suffice, not because it is of minor importance but because it has to-day about run its course. It gave character and direction to the first great period of Old Testament science, which extended from Astruc to Wellhausen, from 1753 to 1901, the latter being the year when Gunkel's *Genesis* appeared. The contemporaries of Wellhausen devoted almost their entire strength to the development of literary criticism, and in this way they arrived at conclusions that are of permanent significance. No one to-day can escape the force of these conclusions, even though in matters of detail minor modifications continue to be made.

The method consisted in fixing attention on the repetitions, the contradictions and the changes of names and forms of expression in the biblical text, in order to restore with their help the different sources on documents that had been used. In this way scholars succeeded in discovering in the Hexateuch four source-books, which are now generally recognized, and with reference to the time of whose composition there are only slight differences of opinion. These differences, however, become greater, when one inquires concerning the conclusions reached relative to the other historical books of the Old Testament; and opinions become radically divergent when it comes to the Psalms and Prophets.

In other words, literary criticism has justified itself for Hebrew prose, especially in the case of the Hexateuch, but not for Hebrew poetry. The understanding of the Psalms and Prophets it has not advanced, but has

actually hindered. The difference in result in the two cases is to be explained by the difference in the two types of literature. It is not only false, but absurd, to apply the principles of literary criticism which were, so to speak, created for the prose narratives of the Hexateuch, to poetry and prophecy, which represent altogether different conditions of spiritual experience.

Nevertheless, the results attained by literary criticism should not be underestimated. As a consequence of the fact that the chronological order of the sources of the Hexateuch has been established with a high degree of probability, the history of Israelitic literature has for the first time won for itself a firm footing. The biblical phenomena, often so perplexing in their diversity, have been chronologically separated, and their apparently meaningless confusion has been transformed into a rational order of events, which is worthy of the divine operation and intelligible to the human spirit. Two great works, those of the Yahwist and Elohist, indeed, one might say, the two finest prose writings of preexilic Israel, have been restored to their classic form or at least brought out into such distinct independence that one might properly speak of their rediscovery. The five books of Moses, which to so zealous a Bible reader as Goethe were in part "unpalatable" because necessarily unintelligible to him, have to-day as a result of literary criticism been made readable again, a service that should not be minimized. Then along with the Yahwist and Elohist is the Priestly Code, a work of post-exilic Judaism, as marked in its individuality as it is distinguished in character. Its rediscovery likewise signifies a valuable enrichment of the history of Israelitic literature.

2. THE HISTORY OF LITERARY FORMS (*Gattungsgeschichte*)

A new path, by which to approach the ideal of an historical exposition of Old Testament literature, is opened up by "the history of literary forms." This line of investigation is still comparatively recent, and the publicity thus far given it is so limited that neither its problems nor its results are yet adequately appreciated.

It starts with the fundamental presupposition that, as in all literatures of the world, so also in the Israelitic-Jewish, there are definite forms or types, and that it is, therefore, the task of science sharply to define the nature of these forms and to write their history. The fact that there are in the Old Testament different literary forms is not open to question, for the names of such forms have in many cases been handed down to us by tradition, as for example in the Psalms "Songs of Praise" and "Prayers of Thanksgiving."

When now one goes through the Psalms and arranges them with this in view, one soon discovers a whole series of songs which are so full of praise to God that one could not well call them anything else than "Songs of Praise"; and then again there is another series, in which thanksgiving comes so prominently into the foreground that one could hardly avoid calling them "Songs of Thanksgiving." But one soon learns that these two groups are not sufficiently comprehensive to include all the different

kinds of psalms. There are, for instance, songs that glorify the king, hence "Royal Psalms"; and then there are prayers that are so full of lamentation that we naturally call them "Songs of Lamentation" or "Elegiac Songs." Then when we examine more carefully these elegiac songs, and inquire who the complainant is, whether it is an *I* or a *We*, we soon learn to distinguish within this class two groups: *personal* elegies and *national* elegies. Having had one's attention directed in one instance to this distinction between *I* and *We*, we then extend it to the other literary forms or classes and in each case carefully inquire whether the psalm in question is of the individual or collective type. As soon as one has carried through such a classification of the psalms according to their several kinds, even though perhaps at first quite roughly and often in matters of detail hesitatingly and feeling one's way uncertainly, one next passes to the task of analyzing the form and content more precisely.

The best way to begin is with the introductory and concluding formulas. These in most cases indicate quite clearly the particular literary form represented by the psalm under consideration. This is also often the case with modern compositions. "Dear brethren in Christ" is the beginning, and "to all eternity, Amen," the close of a sermon. "My dear sir" is the beginning and "Very respectfully yours" is the close of a letter. "There was once upon a time" is the beginning, and "If they are not dead, they are living still" is the close of a fairy tale. In the same typical way, or rather still more so, since the modern man can more easily free himself from bondage to form, some psalms begin: "Out of deep need cry I unto thee, O Lord"; others begin quite as regularly, "Praise the Lord, ye his saints." The former are "the Songs of Lamentation," the latter "the Songs of Praise."

Having examined the introductory and concluding formulas, we proceed to a study of the total structure of the Psalms. What parts, we ask, are connected together? How long are these parts? How are they related to each other? How is the transition made from one to the other? In short, we inquire concerning everything which has to do with the external and internal form of the Psalms.

But the content also cannot be altogether separated from such historical investigations of the form. One needs to inquire concerning the different motives and materials, the ideas and figures of speech, which the poet employs. In this connection it is also worth while noting the outward attendant circumstances that are frequently either expressly mentioned or merely alluded to. This is important in answering the question as to what situation in life originally gave rise to the particular literary form under consideration. For instance, in the "songs of thanksgiving" there are frequent references to "thank offerings"; and from this we are justified in concluding that originally, the "song of thanksgiving" and the "thank offering" belonged closely together. Indeed, the two can in Hebrew be designated by one and the same word. This kind of psalm was, then, originally a "thank offering song." But as contrasted with it there are some psalms that expressly emphasize the fact that the Lord does not desire offerings but only hymns and prayers. This fact manifestly points

to an historical development. The original "thank offering songs," which were sung by the devout in connection with the sacrificial meal, later became hymns of a purely spiritual character, sung apart from the sacrificial meal. Hence the further question arises as to how this change was effected, and what the relation of the psalms in general was to sacrifices and to prophecy with its anti-sacrificial attitude. From such inquiries as these important conclusions can be drawn concerning the history of psalm-writing.

At present we are able to form an approximate idea of the value that the scientific study of the history of literary forms has, particularly in the case of the Psalms. We recognize in the Psalter certain definite, sharply outlined types, each of which has its own form and its own content, its own introductory and concluding formulas, its own structure, its own motives, themes, and figures of speech, its own grammatical methods of expression and its own vocabulary. He who knows the type, knows also the individual example. To be sure there are psalms which can only with difficulty be subsumed under any type. But their number is small, and their artistic quality for the most part not very high, as might naturally be surmised. Actual difficulties are confined almost wholly to the alphabetic songs, the psalms in which a "learned" playing with the initial letters of the successive lines or verses overshadows everything else. One needs, however, to be on his guard against establishing resemblances where none exist, and one should be ready to recognize special forms wherever they are found. The correct method will avoid the leveling tendency. Indeed, the more sharply the type of a certain kind of literature is defined, the more clearly as over against this background will the individual examples stand out, which depart in form and content from the type and thus bear a unique character. At the same time a knowledge of the type often contributes to the understanding of a difficult text. It is strange how little effort has heretofore been made to explain the Psalms by themselves, that is, by the help of the numerous parallel examples that appear in the Psalter.

Only by means of the scientific study of literary forms is it possible to write a history of the Psalms. For such a study teaches us to become acquainted with that large number of psalms, which have been handed down to us outside of the Psalter from the earliest to the latest period: from the Song of Miriam and of Deborah down to the Psalter of Solomon, the psalms of Jesus the Son of Sirach interspersed among his sayings, the psalms in the Christian literature, so far as it was influenced by Judaism, in the Gospels or in the Odes of Solomon. He, who is able to master this extraordinarily rich material, will be able out of the literary specimens contained in it to reconstruct the history of a lost literature, and to set forth the history of our Psalter both in its preparatory stages and in the period subsequent to its completion. He will be able to tell us when the psalm-literature attained its highest development; for, like every other literature, it grew to maturity, blossomed, and then faded away. One needs only read the songs in the Psalter of Solomon, inwardly corroded as they are by reflection and feeble alike in form and content,

to realize the enormous distance that separates them from the Davidic Psalter. From this it may properly be concluded that the blossoming period of the psalm-literature, the time of its highest development, was from the ninth to the seventh century B. C.

What the scientific study of the history of literary forms has accomplished and will still accomplish in the case of the Psalms, it also either has done or will do for the other fields of Old Testament literature: for lyric poetry in general, both profane and religious, for prophecy and the Wisdom Literature, for story and history. It is, of course, not a key to everything, and only to a certain extent does it help us in the understanding of the great personalities. In the case of the writing prophets, representing as they do the high point of Israel's literary development, the "history of literature" will necessarily be biographical, and will seek to grasp and to set forth each prophet in his uniqueness as an author. Nevertheless the determination or fixing of literary forms is of fundamental importance also for prophecy. For it shows that it is not the prophetic book but the prophetic oracle that constitutes the literary unit from which the interpretation of the prophets must take its start; and this fact radically modifies the standard heretofore set up for determining whether a passage is genuine or not. A passage is not necessarily a later addition because it fails to connect with what precedes or what follows. As in the case of the Psalms, so here the study of literary forms leads us back into the antecedents of prophecy and forward into its later effects, it leads us back into the lost prophetic literature before the time of Amos and forward into the subsequent influence of prophecy on other fields of Israelitic-Jewish literature. At the same time it yields us new means by which to date the Old Testament prophecies, and also opens up new vistas in our knowledge of the development of the prophetic literature in general.

The same holds true also of the prose literature and the wisdom literature. In all fields the scientific study of literary forms penetrates more deeply into the formal nature and at the same time more deeply also into the content and history of literature. Questions about which men heretofore had busied themselves in vain or which they had not as yet even raised, find now a satisfactory answer; questions concerning the unique character of Hebrew historiography, its origin and development; questions concerning the nature of the Hebrew story and its relation to the legends and fairy tales of other peoples; questions concerning the origin and development of the proverbial wisdom of the Hebrews. Such questions as these one can often answer only by comparison with the literature of related or neighboring peoples. For the history of Israel's literature is only a part of the general literary history of southwestern Asia, from which it cannot be wholly detached. The Old Testament has no reason to fear such a comparison, for it has up to the present always demonstrated its superiority both as regards form and matter to the literature of the whole world; indeed, its greatness and external worth are by means of this comparison brought out into the light more clearly than ever.

3. THE HISTORY OF LITERARY MATERIAL (*Stoffgeschichte*)

While "the history of literary forms" has made the investigation of the typical literary form its task, "the history of literary material" is concerned with the typical content. The latter line of inquiry will always be confined to a limited portion of literature. For "literary material" in the sense here used is not everywhere handed down. Historiography knows only events which never repeat themselves, the single and solitary yesterday, while "literary material" is the eternal yesterday and continually returns. The chief field of the history of literary material is, therefore, folk stories, which operate with fixed traditions and yet more or less transform them according to changing circumstances.

But great poets, like our ballad writers or dramatists, can also use traditional literary material. In this case it is quite self-evident to scientific investigation that it raise the question as to the origin and history of the literary material dealt with and seek to answer it. The literary historian, who aims to appraise the works of Shakespeare, will direct his attention to answering the question as to what "literary material" Shakespeare used and what evidence there is of its existence in the literature before his time or what can be deduced from his own poems as to its previous history. One can, of course, understand Shakespeare without such preliminary studies, and the main thing will always be to immerse oneself in his own works. But only he who is acquainted with the earlier history of his "material" is really in a position to appreciate Shakespeare in his unique greatness and in his creative mastery as over against all his predecessors. The same holds true in a corresponding way of the great literary prophets and their creative mastery as over against the popular traditions which they are supposed to have incorporated in their preaching.

Only a very few workers have thus far arisen in the field of "the history of literary material." The chief reason probably for this is that students have been frightened away by the difficulties of the task. For to the superficial observer it seems as though the criticism of "literary material" was a less tangible thing to deal with than literary criticism; but it only seems so, and this seeming arises from the unfamiliar nature of the problem. To the philologist, for whom nothing but the written has any value, the only natural thing is to refer contradictions in the biblical text to divergent written sources. But it has now been shown that the oldest written source, revealed to us by literary criticism, the Yahwist, in spite of the excision of all foreign additions, still contains all manner of contradictions; and it is a current belief that we cannot really master this written source except by carrying it back to two yet older source books, the first and second Yahwist. If, however, this process is carried much farther, the result before long will be atoms, no longer visible to ordinary eyes. The idea that oral transmission of literary material preceded its reduction to written form has not seemed to occur to critics, or at least they have not taken it seriously. And yet the truth of this fact is one concerning which one may be convinced by any collection whatsoever

of folk-tales, as for example that from present day Palestine published in 1916 by Hans Schmidt and Paul Kahle.

As authors may consciously work a story over, so may a story also undergo change in the course of oral transmission, but the change thus brought about is of a quite different nature, as it rests on unconscious deterioration. The deterioration varies in degree according to the relative excellence of the tradition. If the threads are badly intertwined, one is not in a position to disentangle them again. But often it is possible to restore meaning to a complicated and chaotic narrative, and in any case the attempt to do so is infinitely fascinating. Success is most likely to be achieved when different traditions are at one's disposal which can be compared with each other and which can be tested by their inner logical consistency. But even where external evidence is lacking, there is an inner logic, resting on pure inference, that compels assent.

Two examples may serve as illustrations. Heretofore, critics have contented themselves with the fact that the oldest accounts we have of Joseph come from the Yahwist and hence were reduced to written form about the ninth century B. C. The question, however, as to when the stories concerning Joseph originated, they have on the whole not raised. But if we go beyond the methods of literary criticism and deal with the tradition as it lies before us from the standpoint of "the history of literary material," it can be shown that this tradition grew up out of three constituent parts, each differing from the other two. The first part celebrates Joseph as the creator of his tribe; these accounts are historical. The second part has for its theme the rejected brothers, and the third the great Egyptian vizier; these stories employ literary material, that underwent various changes in the course of time until it reached its present form. The origin of the oldest version of the story, traces of which are preserved in Joseph's dream concerning the sheaves, may be assigned to the time of Gideon; the story in its present form arises from the time of Jeroboam. That is, the story attained its full development from 1100 to 900 B. C., while it lived in the mouth of the people. When it was reduced to writing, it underwent only slight changes.

The history of literary material, for the most part, reaches out beyond the Old Testament, because the parallels, that need to be adduced for purposes of comparison, lie before us in other literatures. While much has been written concerning the plant-fable, a comprehensive work dealing with the animal-fable is lacking. To the realm of fable belongs some "literary material" which is used both in the Old and New Testaments. In Isaiah 10. 15 we have a dispute between the axe and man, and in 1 Cor. 12. 14ff. a dispute between the different organs of the human body. One is usually in this connection reminded of Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* or of the fable of Menenius Agrippa, and, perhaps rarely, of the Upanishads of the Veda; but the strife of the stomach and the bodily members was current about one thousand years earlier or about 1200 B. C., as is evidenced by a tablet found in Turin, that came originally from Egypt. This has an important bearing on the question as to the origin of the material. So in general the investigations concerned with the

criticism of literary material are calculated to cast light on the international relations of Israelitic literature.

Whatever opinion one may form in matters of detail concerning the significance of the results which have thus far been achieved by the scientific study of "literary forms" and "literary material" or which these lines of investigation still hold out in prospect before us, in any case we have here to do with new and pioneer paths that are being opened alongside of the already beaten track of literary criticism, the aim being to reach the goal common to all, that of a history of Israelitic literature. In special praise of all this critical work inseparable from science, it may be said that it is carried on in a spirit of profound piety, and that the critics deal in a reverent way with the Old Testament tradition. So in spite of the human acumen directed toward the analysis of the biblical text and the rediscovery of the history that lay back of it, nay, rather because of this very acumen the glory of the divine revelation in the Old Testament becomes all the more resplendent.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[Appended to sections 2 and 3; abbreviated and rearranged by the translator.]

Hermann Gunkel: *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (1895); *Kommentar zur Genesis* (1901); *Ausgewählte Psalmen* (1903); *Die Israelitische Literatur*, in "Kultur der Gegenwart" (1906); *Das Märchen im Alten Testament* (1917); *Die Propheten* (1917).

Hugo Gressmann: *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905); *Mose und seine Zeit* (1913); *Die literarische Analyse Deuteronomias*, in "Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft" (1914); *Ursprung und Entwicklung der Joseph-Saga*, in *Festschrift für Gunkel* (not yet published); *Amos und Hosea*, in "Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl" (1921).

Hans Schmidt, *Die Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament* (1911); W. Staerk, *Die Lyrik*, in "Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl" (1911); O. Eissfeldt, *Der Maschal* (1913); R. Kittel, *Psalmen* (1914); Baumgartner, *Die Klagegedichte des Jeremia* (1917).

HUGO GRESSMAN.

University of Berlin, Germany.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK

A PAPAL PROCLAMATION

POPE PIUS XI sent out a notable Encyclical to universal Romanism as a Christmas Message. Much of it is devoted to the peace of the world. He says that the church of Christ alone can give peace to the world—which is most true, if by the church of Christ is meant universal Christianity and not merely the Holy Roman Church. But we do not wish to

weaken the value of his letter to his own people. Let us hope that the new Pope is broader religiously than the bigoted Pius X or that politician, Benedict XV.

A very valuable element in this Encyclical is its noble insistence on the much neglected truth that no distinction must be made between public and private morals. Nations must conform to the same divine law as individuals, and the international code of morals must be as thoroughly Christian as that obtaining between private persons. He says: "From this it appears that Christ's peace is only possible under those conditions found in Christ's kingdom. Therefore Christ reigns over individuals, if these observe his laws; reigns over families when these keep inviolate the sacramental character of marriage, and reigns over society when this acknowledges God's supreme, universal sovereignty."

The Pope also announces that he is considering the possibility of calling a great Ecumenical Council in connection with the coming jubilee year, whose primary object shall be the peace of the world and international good will. Dare we Protestants hope that this proposed council, and the Constituent Council just held by the "Whites" of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church at Moscow will be means of modernizing both the Latin and the Greek communions and of infusing them with the evangelical spirit?

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND RELIGION

THE democratic movement in Europe has always been largely under atheistic leadership. There are reasons for that—an autocratic church which identifies itself with the tyranny of personal rule, a paganized religion that has lost the Christian sense of brotherhood and service and a Hellenized theology that makes the future life, rather than a redeemed and transformed world, the goal of suffering humanity. Who can greatly wonder that the Soviet government in Russia, hating the ecclesiastical despotism which was the strongest weapon of imperialism, covers Petrograd and Moscow with placards reading, "Religion is the opiate of the people"?

It is not Christian for us to denounce socialism, or even communism, as atheistic. The Jerusalem church when they had "all things in common" were not atheists. But the Marxian doctrine of economic determinism, with its theory of class war, is irreligious. It is not greatly different from the ethical theory back of the economic doctrines of the capitalistic crowd in our own and every country. To punish political propaganda in behalf of any theory of government is not only a violation of the democratic right of free speech—it is a justification of the use of revolutionary methods as the only possible method of attaining a new social order. This was the noble argument of Charles Edward Hughes when he protested against the exclusion of Socialists from the New York Legislature.

How can we save religion in Russia? Only by introducing a serving church, which stands for social and industrial democracy as the true out-

come of the spiritual democracy of the kingdom of God. The Russian *moujik*, or peasant, is naturally religious. No man, in spite of his ignorance, dirt, and passion, has greater patience, larger gift of self-sacrifice, or subtler mysticism. He needs a Christian ethic as an expression of his high spiritual aspiration.

Can any one wonder that Methodism has been able to maintain as free a field of action in Soviet Russia as any evangelical denomination? When Lenin and Trotsky have read the Methodist Discipline with its Social Creed, when they have seen the sacrificial service of Sister Anna, our deaconess in Petrograd, and when they have noted the noble programs of such men as Bishops Nuelsen, Blake, and Bast, as they face the problems of a blighted and blasted Europe, they certainly cannot see in such a vision of a social Christianity anything but an inward democracy of spirit which outranks all outward mechanical programs for industrial democracy.

It is with absorbing interest that we note the rising tide of religion in the midst of revolutionary Russia. With a sort of joyful fear one awaits the outcome of the revolution taking place in the Holy Orthodox Church. A body of its bishops and clergy, called "The Orthodox White Clergy of the Living Church," organized a Constituent Council which will meet in Moscow, April, 1923, which hopes to reform and reorganize the Russian church. The Soviet government are compelled to tolerate this movement, simply because they are aware of the religious zeal of their peasant millions. Our three Methodist bishops in Europe were assigned by our Board of Bishops to attend this council as fraternal delegates, in response to an invitation which the leaders of "The Living Church" extended to them through Bishop Nuelsen. Such attendance may be a most difficult and delicate duty but it is a high honor and a great opportunity.

What is the mission of Methodism both to Europe and to Russia? Not primarily to make them Methodist but to inject into the religious life of the churches and people the two fundamental elements of Christian life—a rich personal inward experience and an outward life of sacrificial and social service.

A POPULAR PARISIAN PREACHER

THE new Methodist Episcopal Church in Paris, France, which has been opened as a community center, has the good fortune to possess as its pastor a man who is a profound scholar, rich in philosophic insight, and a brilliant orator, the Rev. E. Wietrich. He is progressively modern in his views, placing emphasis on the Christian life rather than on dogmatic beliefs. He affirms: "I am equally the enemy of all clericalisms, Catholic or Protestant, spiritistic or theosophic, as well as those of Free Thought. I believe in a living Christianity." In a recent issue of *Le Revue du Methodisme Episcopal Français*, in discussing spiritual religion, he includes this remarkable passage:

"Do you ask me what I think of Christ? Here is my answer. The Christ for me is a great experience; he has been and still is for millions

of beings a source of life, of regeneration and of salvation. This fact is sustained both by psychology and history. For me, this is the mighty fact that interests me. When one measures the muscular strength of a man, he lets him exercise by pulling at a dynamometer and the motion of the needle gives the proof. To appreciate the spiritual value of a being, we must observe the influence he has on souls. I leave to theologians, to metaphysicians, to theosophists, the task of determining the nature of Christ and his origin, and am content to establish the marvelous efficacy of his Spirit upon souls. If, in that light, it were right to assert that God and Christ have been enriched by all the fervor and aspirations of humanity, it would still be necessary to seek whence comes the mysterious energy which has produced that galvanism in our poor humanity, so wretched and gasping for life. How if left to itself could it have done other than devour its own substance? . . . Genuine Christianity, far from fading away, belongs to the future; it is a glorious outlook, whose perspective reaches the Infinite of Thought and Love. . . . Our souls, like certain birds of the air, should know enough to emigrate, to abandon their dearest resting places, and dart toward a new heaven and a new earth. For I am sure that life, after having been wrapped here below in swaddling bands and winding sheets, shall at last clothe us with a coronation robe, incorruptible and immortal. Let us not forget that our earthly existence is nothing but a state of death between two eternities of life."

Pastor Wietrich, before his conversion to this living faith he so eloquently expounds, was a cleric of the Roman Church, teaching philosophy in its schools. Evangelical religion could have no greater acquisition in the Latin world than a man so fervent in faith, so rich in imagination, so eloquent in speech, and so sane in thinking. Having brought the pragmatic test to theology, he has attained the true Methodist ideal of Christian experience and service.

BOOK NOTICES

BOOK BULLETIN

CHARLES DARWIN once remarked to Samuel Butler that he did not believe it was reviews or advertisements but simply "being talked about" that sold a book. He was quite right, but undoubtedly a vigorous review will often cause a book to be talked about. . . . There is this defect in reviews—the best are written by men of strong convictions and they judge books from their own viewpoint. . . . Butler himself said, "Books should be tried by a judge and jury as though they were crimes, and counsel should be heard on both sides." . . . Perhaps that should be the method of the METHODIST REVIEW—have a *pro* and *con* criticism, and the editor play judge. . . . John Wesley called himself *homo unius libri*, a man of one book, meaning of course the Bible. But no man of his time read more books, both classic and current. He knew his Bible better because he brought it to an enriched intellect. The One Book illumined

all good books and the latter helped to understand it. . . . Read your Bible in the original, a bit from the Greek Testament every day. Read it in the matchless music of the Authorized Version, correcting its text and translation from the American Revision. And then read Moffatt's New Translation of the New Testament to get the flavor of the popular speech in which Paul and the evangelists wrote. . . . Don't read too many books, but take some time for thinking. Yet the mind needs exercise as much as the body and more time should be spent in the study than on the golf links. Yet decent sport may help to recreate the brain as well as the brawn. . . . Let us be a little wary of "best sellers." For a popular book is frequently not merely an easy or pleasant book to read but one that flatters folks by echoing their errors and prejudices. Only people with scrambled brains relish the novels of Harold Bell Wright. . . . The public is not an infallible tribunal of either intellectual or moral excellence. . . . Yet the literature of power should always be adapted to the popular mind. . . . Critics are book-tasters. It is a perilous profession, one that sometimes may turn book-hunger into book-surfeit and produce mental dyspepsia. But they save readers a lot of work, for an able criticism as often steers us away from an impossible book as attracts us toward one. . . . As a mental diversion spend a little time every month browsing in a bookshop. . . . To do this and read the METHODIST REVIEW will save you much money, for you will be saved from purchasing books you don't want. . . . Here are some suggestions which may help you, if you think you can trust the writer. . . . Most of us have read Rauschenbusch's works on religious sociology, and the rest of us ought to. Now add to them Tawney's *The Acquisitive Society*, not perhaps to agree with all it says, but to absorb its noble ideal that the true object of all business is not profits but service. . . . All men should work either with hands or brains not to get but to give. That is Christianity. . . . And then add to that Ellwood's *Reconstruction of Religion*, which was reviewed in the September-October issue, 1922. . . . Some complain that our notices do not contain very full quotations from the books reviewed. There are good reasons for that. 1. There is danger of violating copyright laws. 2. Authors object to having their books disemboweled. 3. If a book is worth having, it should be read as a whole and not in scraps. 4. An anthology is not a review. . . . Are we saying too much about books? It may be well to imitate John Selden in his *Table Talk*, written nearly three hundred years ago: "In answering a book it is best to be short; otherwise he that I write against will suspect I intend to weary him, not to satisfy him. Besides in being long I shall give my adversary a huge advantage; somewhere or other he will pick a hole." . . . Now please read, skim, or skip our Book Notices—just as you please.

A Manual Lexicon of the New Testament. By G. ABBOTT-SMITH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

DR. DEISSMANN, as far back as 1909, in his *Light from the Ancient East*, wrote that one of the most important tasks of New Testament

research was the preparation of a lexicon of the New Testament. He went on to deplore the fact that there was not even a manual lexicon which took account of the recent advances in etymology and the large amount of material furnished by the papyri and the inscriptions. An ideal lexicon, he claimed, should do three things: (1) it should place the vocabulary of the New Testament in living linguistic connection with the contemporary world, and (2) ascertain carefully the changes a word has undergone in various periods, also (3) simplify and put warmth into the popular concepts of primitive Christianity, artificially complicated by scholastic prejudice and a too anxious process of isolation. Such a lexicon Deissmann claims would bring out once more the simplicity, vividness and force of the utterances of evangelists and prophets, and would be of real help to the preacher in the lonely parsonage of the *Westercald* or in the hired lodgings of the city preacher. It would help on a Saturday (*sic*) morning to unfold the thought in the sacred text to the benefit of the Sabbath congregation. Such a lexicon would, we think, be also of great service to many town and city pastors both in England and in America.

Since Deissmann wrote these words we have had Souter's pocket-lexicon of the Greek New Testament which made some small attempt to fulfill Deissmann's canons of a lexicon. Much interesting use was made of the new knowledge which Souter thinks will sweep into the dustbin a deal of the well-meant but hair-splitting theology of the past. For example, in the phrase (1 Cor. 10. 11) translated in R. V. "upon whom the ends of the ages have come," the two words, *τελος*, translated "end," and *καταστώ*, translated "have come," the former can mean also revenues, dues, and the latter word was used of property which came down by inheritance to an heir; hence the phrase can be translated "upon whom the revenues of the ages have come down as an inheritance." Interesting light is given by Souter on such words as *δοκιμος*, in James 1. 3, which means "that which is genuine," "the approved part"; *ἀνάπαυσις*, in Matt. 11. 27, which means respite or temporary rest as a preparation for future toil; *ἑπ' αὐτοῦ*, "single," that is, directed toward one object; *πολίτευμα*, in Phil. 3. 20 translated in A. V. "conversation" and in R. V. "citizenship," is used of a colony of foreigners, whose organization is a miniature copy of the *πολιτεία* at home; this excellent sense Dr. Moffatt adopts in his translation, "we are a colony of heaven."

Now we have this excellent manual Lexicon by Dr. G. Abbott-Smith. The book, though issued in 1922, should bear the date 1917 or 1918, for the proof sheets were sent to the printer in 1917, but owing to the war was not published till the spring of 1922; in consequence, Dr. Abbott-Smith was not able to avail himself of the valuable lexical material found in Burton's *Galatians* and Charles' *Revelation* and parts three and four of Moulton and Mulligan's *Lexicon of the Papyri*. This lexicon is much fuller than Souter's and much more condensed and convenient to use than Thayer's Lexicon, which has done such excellent service for the last thirty years and which is very useful to-day in many respects.

Among the merits of this new lexicon are, in the first place, it

avails itself largely of the new knowledge made accessible during the last twenty-five years. Compare, for example, the discussion of the word *ἀπλῶς* in Thayer and Abbott-Smith.

THAYER

1. To please, Mark 6. 22; Matt. 14. 6.
2. To strive to please, to accommodate oneself to the opinion, desires, and interests of others, 1 Cor. 10. 33.

ABBOTT-SMITH

1. To please, Matt. 14. 6.
2. In late Greek, especially in Inscriptions, to render service, which meaning fits such passages as Rom. 15. 1-3, 1 Cor. 10. 33, 1 Thess. 2. 4.

1 Cor. 10. 33 can be translated, "I *serve* all men in all things," which is much better than "I *please* all men in all things." Under *ἀρέχω* Dr. Abbott-Smith adopts the rendering "It is enough" for *ἀρεχαι* in Mark 14. 41 following Field, though he gives references to passages in Deissmann which show the financial uses of the word and quotes the following passages in the New Testament, Matt. 6. 2, Phil. 4. 18, where the word has a financial coloring. Souter thinks that it has a financial meaning in Mark 14. 41 and that *ὁ λοῦθας* should be understood. The verse could then be translated, "Then he came to them a third time and said to them 'Still asleep? Still resting? Judas has received payment.'"

It is strange that Dr. Abbott-Smith in discussing the word *ἐπιβάλλω*, in Mark 14. 72, should have omitted the reference to the word in Moulton and Mulligan's Lexicon, p. 235, pt. iii, where examples of the word in the papyri are quoted with meaning "set to," hence *ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαυεν*, "he set to and wept," or as Moffatt translates, "he burst into tears." How like Peter!

In the second place the lexicon contains very full references to recent commentaries and articles in various Bible dictionaries where the different words can be further studied. These form a very valuable part of the lexicon. Take for example the references under the word *μυστήριον*; first of all the development in the meaning of this interesting Greek word is given: 1. That which is known to the *μύστης*, a secret doctrine. 2. In later writers that which may not be revealed (not however as in the modern sense intrinsically difficult to understand). 3. In the New Testament the word is used of the counsels of God once hidden but now revealed in the gospel or some fact thereof. Then there are added the following references where the word can be further studied: Westcott's *Ephesians*, p. 180; Armitage Robinson's *Ephesians* 2. 34ff., Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 165. Hatch's article in *Hastings' Dictionary*, vol. 3, p. 465. The article in the *Dictionary of Jesus Christ and the Gospels*, p. 213, vol. ii, and to these we may add the article by Kennedy in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* and the one in the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, both of which have appeared since Doctor Abbott-Smith wrote his lexicon. To derive the fullest possible benefit from this lexicon it will be necessary for many men to make a few important purchases for their libraries. There is also a very useful list of Scripture references for all the principal words.

A third merit of the lexicon is the emphasis it lays on the synonyms of the New Testament. Under the word *ἁμαρτία* are given the nine synonyms for sin in the New Testament: *ἁμαρτία, ἀγνοῖα, ἀνομία, ἀσεβεία, ἡρῆμα, παράβασις, παρακοή, παρανομία, παραπτῶμα*. The distinction between the three words *ἀνοχή, μακροθυμία*, and *ὑπομονή*, translated "patience" in the versions is given as follows: *ἀνοχή*, forbearance, which is the result *μακροθυμία*; of involving the idea of tolerance, long-suffering, for example, God with sinners; *ὑπομονή* expresses patience with respect to things as *μακροθυμία*, patience with respect to persons; *ὑπομονή* is active as well as passive and means not only endurance but perseverance.

In the fourth place Doctor Abbott-Smith has also, following the example of Thayer, endeavored wherever possible to give the etymology of the Greek words. Take, for example, the synonyms for sin mentioned above: *ἁμαρτία*, from *ἀναπράνω*, literally a missing the mark; *ἀγνοῖα*, from *ἀγνέω*, to be ignorant; *ἀνομία*, a = negative and *νομος*, law; *ἀσεβεία*, a = negative and *εἰβω*, to reverence; *ἡρῆμα*, from *ἡρῶ*, to defeat; *παράβασις*, from *πάρα*, by, and *βαίω*, to go; *παραπτῶμα*, from *παρα* and *πτω*, to fall; *παρακοή*, from *παρα* and *ακούω*, to hear. Sin is viewed in the synonyms from various aspects, now as failure, ignorance, lawlessness, irreverence and again as defeat, transgression, disobedience, and trespass. Until Doctor Deissmann brings out his lexicon of the New Testament, all students will be greatly indebted to Doctor Abbott-Smith for this excellent manual lexicon.

Drew Seminary.

J. NEWTON DAVIES.

The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development. By JULIUS A. BEWER. Pp. xiv+452. (Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies. Edited by James T. Shotwell.) New York: Columbia University Press. Price, \$5, net.

PROFESSOR BEWER of Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University has published a volume which students of the Old Testament have long been wishing for. Every person interested in the Old Testament will find in it not only a mine of information, but a fascinating presentation of the literature of the Hebrews through the centuries. It is with genuine pleasure that the reviewer commends to the readers of the METHODIST REVIEW a volume that possesses qualities seldom found harmoniously joined in biblical investigation: it is both readable and thorough, comprehensive and compact, original and reliable, pious and scholarly.

The plan of this book is new in several respects. The standard Introductions to the Old Testament deal with the single books as units, taking them up either in the order of the Hebrew or Greek (English) canon, or arranging them topically (for example, Cornill: History, Prophecy, Poetry). This method was inevitable in the earlier stages of biblical criticism and still has its advantages. But the time has come when it is possible to write a chronological history of the extant literature of the Israelites and Jews, studying all fragments of poetry and prose pre-

served in the Old Testament in their historical, rather than in their canonical, setting. This Professor Bewer does with the skill of a master.

Again the author has left the beaten track by enriching his discussion with abundant translations from the original Hebrew. We have here an anthology as well as a literary history. Nearly all of the preexilic poetry of high quality is represented here, adding materially to the charm and usefulness of the book. In fact, the original plan (modified owing to publishing conditions due to the war) was "to publish translations of the most important texts of the Old Testament, grouped topically" (p. vii). It may safely be said that nothing has been lost by the change of plan. Both in the conception and in the execution of this plan, the author deserves the highest commendation; our one objection, if it be an objection, is that in two respects he has attempted the impossible.

First of all, the material at our command is not sufficient for a literary history of the Hebrews. Just as the historian faces an unbridged gap between 586 and 520 B. C., just as the theologian lacks all sources explaining the origin of the religious conceptions of Amos, so the literary historian has nothing but a few scattered fragments of what must have been a marvelous literary production, now lost forever. This fact is not brought out with sufficient vividness. On the contrary, we get the impression that we still have the complete text of such poems as the psalm of Myriam (Exod. 15. 21) (p. 2), and the dirge of David over Abner (2 Sam. 3. 33f.) (p. 17), when it is evident that the narrators have reported only a snatch of the original composition; a much later author supplemented the missing sections of Myriam's song with a composition of his own (Exod. 15. 1ff.). The interest of the men who collected the writings of the Old Testament into the three canons of the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings was not literary, but religious: the greatest masterpieces of poetry and of prose in the Old Testament, namely, the Song of Deborah and 2 Sam. 9-20, have survived by accident, for they were demonstrably missing in the first edition of the Book of Judges and of the Book of Samuel, having been added by a later editor. This being the case, who dares say how many literary jewels perished forever either because they were not considered divinely inspired, or because they were not thought to be sufficiently edifying? The Song of Songs would have been lost had it not been interpreted allegorically, had its real meaning been fully apprehended!

In the second place the present status of Old Testament scholarship does not warrant an objective, unbiased and trustworthy history of Old Testament literature. Even if we admit that "the main lines of the development are sure enough to warrant our weaving the single literary results in a story, which in itself will be a means of judging their plausibility and validity" (p. xii), we are often compelled to dissent from Professor Bewer in special points which are not without importance. The assertion that the Law of the Covenant is "so much like the Babylonian law of Hammurapi" (p. 32), though constantly repeated, seems to me not justified by the facts. There is no foundation for the traditional view that the wife of Hosea, Gomer, was unfaithful to him (if we believe the

narrative contained in Hos. 1), nor that she should be identified with the wretched creature of Hos. 3 (p. 94f.).

In the analysis of the Deuteronomic Laws (p. 124f.) the use of modern terminology (supreme court, registrars, the office of chaplains, etc.) is rather misleading. His effort to bring logical order in the miscellaneous arrangement of these statutes seems hopeless; his twelve subdivisions are nearly as bewildering as the original. If the collectors of these laws had any plan in mind, which may be questioned, for the text shows evidence of successive expansion, it seems to have been: 1. Laws about God (Deut. 12. 1 to 17. 1); 2. Laws about the state (17. 2 to 21. 19); 3. Laws about the family (21. 10 to 22. 30); 4. Laws about individuals (23. 1 to 25. 19) (rituals: 26. 1-15). This scheme is followed only in a general sense; many of the laws are arranged without any order whatsoever.

The story of Ezra's return in 458 B. C. is so contrary to the unimpeachable testimony of Nehemiah that, in order to maintain that we have here "the memoirs of Ezra" Professor Bewer (p. 281) is obliged to transfer this event twenty years later. Even then the story remains unbelievable and, with Professor Torrey, we must admit that these "memoirs of Ezra" are the product of the fertile pen of the Chronicler, the editor of the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah.

Professor Bewer has not resisted the temptation of describing the occasions for which certain Psalms were originally written. Psa. 110 "was probably composed expressly for the coronation of Simon the Hasmonean in 142" (p. 369). Before him Professor Briggs, in his Commentary on the Psalms, had told us that Psa. 45 was composed for the marriage of Jehu! All this fiction should be excluded from scholarly investigations.

We must resist the temptation of discussing other points worthy of comment. A general agreement of Old Testament students on the solution of biblical problems is out of the question. We must be grateful to Professor Bewer for this clear presentation of the generally accepted results of biblical criticism and of his views on questions that are still *sub judice*: these contributions of his own are often excellent and always welcome and suggestive.

Harvard University.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER.

Historic Christianity and the New Theology. By HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D. Louisville, Ky.: Pentecostal Publishing Co. Pp. 208. Price, \$1, postpaid.

THIS is the first volume that has ever been written recently dedicated to the serious study of the education for the ministry of more than 1,000 candidates annually, who have not had the advantages of a college or theological training.

It is by the man who, because of brains, culture, utter devotion, mastery of the subject, and forensic ability of an unusual type, is the recognized leader of a large majority in Methodism (and of the last General Conference) who stand for a positive belief in historic Christianity and

a positive faith in the traditional doctrines of the church as set forth in the Apostles' Creed. Doctor Sloan, with many other Methodists, thinks there are those in our church who, writing under the cloak of freedom and science (a very volatile word), manifest a negative attitude toward the vital doctrines of Christianity. He proposes that all our colleges and theological schools shall have the chairs in English Bible occupied by persons who hold and practice a positive faith as set forth in the doctrinal standards of our church; the purging of The Methodist Book Concern of those books repugnant to our faith and order; and the remaking of our Conference Course of Study that it may include only those books which maintain the positive teachings that have always been regarded as essential for Methodist preachers, if they are to preach a whole gospel with power.

Doctor Sloan defines the position of the church as interpreted by the action of the last General Conference, and gives the law that was passed a careful interpretation, which we suppose he is able to do, for he wrote it. In view of the action by the General Conference that "no book should be given place in any of the courses of study except such as are in full and hearty accord with the doctrines and that outline of faith established in the Constitution of the church," the author has studied every book in the course and says: "As we read these books, it seemed to us that several deny the Atonement in Christ's death, or else set it aside; that several deny or ignore Justification by Faith; that some deal slightly with the fact of the virgin birth, while others slight or set aside the fact of Jesus's resurrection. Some deny the fall of man and teach the exploded dogma of Darwinian evolution. Some treat haltingly the Christian supernatural, make conscience a product of social evolution and utility and relate prayer and inspiration to upgushes from the subconscious mind. They make the faith in the Incarnation an evolution of the centuries rather than an authoritative teaching of Christ; and not only the apostles but the Saviour himself is charged with error by them, and that with respect to a major item of his gospel. All this they do, and more, and many of these things are done, not in one of the books but in several."

This is his thesis. The author then analyzes the Course of Study book by book and names *New Testament History*, by Doctor Rall; *The Pupil and the Teacher*, by Doctor Weigle; *The Graded Sunday School*, by Doctor Meyer; *History of the Christian Church*, by Doctor Walker; *The Christian Pastor*, by Doctor Gladden; *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, by Doctor Hayes; and *The Five Great Philosophies of Life*, by Doctor Hyde; and points out where and how each of these books is not only out of harmony with our church standards, undermining to the faith on essential points of the Christian gospel, but names other books that cover the ground and are in his estimation better adapted as text books for the purpose, against which no such objection could be made.

Our author does not launch a broadside against these and other books and the authors, but in one of the most discriminating works we remember to have read, he points out where in many instances the same author has written many great constructive and useful books which have

been ignored in the Courses of Study, but a single volume written by the author not in a constructive mood has been put into the Course when not only have the undergraduates, who must study such books, had an injustice thrust upon them, but the author thus himself selected has been misrepresented.

For instance, Doctor Sloan objects strenuously to the inclusion of *Studies in Christianity*, by Borden P. Bowne. This does not mean, however, that he objects to Bowne as a Christian teacher, for this book pays a beautiful tribute to Bowne's philosophy, acknowledges how much the church owes to him, recommends his great constructive works and thinks some of them ought to be put in the Conference Course of Study, such as his *Personalism*, his *Principles of Theism*, his *Immanence of God*, his *Principles of Ethics*. But his *Studies in Christianity* is not a treatise or a text book, but the assembling of a group of essays written, many of them, for secular magazines, and is a somewhat miscellaneous assortment which does not represent the best or greatest constructive work of Bowne, the thinker, the intellectual leader.

This is a fair sample of his mode of criticism, and Sloan's reference will be found to be no more radical than the recently published letters of Principal James Denney to W. Robertson Nicoll: "Bowne's *Studies in Christianity* will be a seductive and impressive book to many, but he seems to me almost always just to stop short of what is most vital in the New Testament conception of Christianity. There is a lot of this kind of thinking among Canadian Methodists, and I cannot be reconciled to it. I like lucidity as much as any one, but I like still better the sense of magnitude and even of immensity in a man dealing with revealed religion. Fog is abominable, but it is not so abominable as a man who thinks he has taken the measure of the breadth and length and depth and height, and that he knows all round what passes knowledge."

We think there is no doubt that Doctor Sloan makes out a case against Prof. Williston Walker of Yale, whose book on *The History of the Christian Church* was evidently written to account for Christianity without a supernatural Christ; without a Holy Spirit; or without any substantiating facts of such accepted verities as the Virgin birth, the Resurrection of Christ, the miracles wrought by him or by his apostles. There are various histories of the Christian Church available, such as John F. Hurst's *Short History of the Church*, George R. Crooks' *Story of the Christian Church*, Moncreave's volume that was in four years ago, without putting a rationalist's explanation of the phenomenon of Christianity before our students to be accepted as having the approval of the church by its inclusion in a Course of Study that was to be in harmony with our doctrines.

He takes up two books by Doctor Rall. In *Modern Premillennialism and the Christian Hope*, "Professor Rall rejects much more than the premillennial theory of the Saviour's return itself, and makes Jesus, as well as his disciples, mistaken in respect to this major item of his teaching, and their belief. To be sure he tries to show that this is quite a reasonable situation, that Jesus was in this respect simply a child of his age,

knowing neither more nor less of history or of science than was known by men about him. But Jesus' gospel, we point out, was not a matter either of history or of science, it was a matter of his own inner spiritual certainty, and in his thought his return was a part of that gospel. If he was mistaken in this matter, his infallibility is gone, and it is gone not in respect of science, but of religion."

It is safe to say that Adam Clarke, Milton S. Terry, James M. Campbell, and a host of scholars that no man can number have come to a study of the words of Jesus bearing upon his second coming, and have found them clear and explicit in their content, and with the understanding of certain symbolical language have found a consistent and full historic fulfillment of every prediction he made or that the New Testament contains about the setting up of the Kingdom, the destruction of Judaism and the personal presence of Jesus, and it is unnecessary to discredit Jesus as a religious teacher in order to get rid of certain unpleasant absurdities that have been foisted upon the church by overzealous adventists.

One may not agree with Doctor Sloan's interpretation of the doctrines of Christianity as interpreted by Methodism, or even his interpretation of the various writers who have been selected, but every fair-minded reader will agree to the essential importance of the subject treated in this volume, and that it is certainly the best volume extant upon the subject, for it is the only one in existence.

One will see that this is not a rabid agitator rending the church, but a student, a scholar, generous to a fault in debating with opponents, guarded as to statements, conciliatory in method, kind and charitable in dealing with motives, constructive in his summary of theological beliefs and of Christian doctrines; not a heresy-hunter, wanting church trials to compel orthodoxy, but a truth-seeker, wanting a free and full discussion of the all-important matters that emerge from a study of the text books our undergraduates have had put in their hands with the implied approval of the Methodist Episcopal Church upon their contents. He is discussing principles, not persons, and when asked "Why don't you bring charges for heresy?" he would reply, "In a free and democratic church, how much better is an open discussion where the truth is likely to emerge when all sides have been heard?"

CLARENCE TRUE WILSON.

Spiritual Messages of the Miracle Stories. By GEORGE HENRY HUBBARD. Pp. xi+341. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. Price, \$2.

The gospel miracles are more than marvels—they are acted parables. They are full of moral and religious purpose. This unique distinction from ecclesiastical miracles helps us to believe in them. The miracle, therefore, should not be first approached from the apologetic standpoint, or be discussed scientifically and philosophically, but as to its spiritual message. And here is immeasurable wealth. Truth and power meet in the works of our Lord. These expositions by Mr. Hubbard are written from this point of view. So it is helpful for preaching and for devotional

reading. Such a book is worth more than a treatise on the possibility, credibility, or evidential value of miracles. This is the wheat of the gospel and not the chaff. Chaff is valuable—it protects the wheat, but the food is in the grain. Here is food for the soul.

So Cana reveals to us "The Social Christ," feeding the five thousand is "Doing the Impossible," Simon's mother-in-law was "Saved to Serve," in the demoniac of Gadere we see "Swine versus Souls," in healing by touch "The Contagion of Character." These are a few examples of thirty-eight miracles expounded. "The Crowning Miracle" is the resurrection of Jesus. It is both a historical fact and a present experience. "*The proof of immortality is the practice of immortality.*"

The real promise of the miracles is an ever-present Christ. He is in the life of to-day. "The problem of religion is always a problem of present worth." "Spiritual forces are the Supreme forces." Greater works shall continue to be done through the Risen Lord. Compassionately viewing a starving world, he still commands Christian America with its abundance, "Give ye them to eat." "Love, and love alone, works true miracles, brings divine gifts to man; and that love is revealing itself wondrously to-day, healing, helping, blessing, enriching our human life in numberless ways." So the New Testament marvels come down to the present with their spiritual message.

"To tell that God is still with us
And love is still miraculous."

The book is beautifully written and is alive with present significance.

Where the Higher Criticism Fails. By W. H. FITCHETT. Pp. 191. The Methodist Book Concern. Price, \$1.25, net.

IN this book the term Higher Criticism is used in the very elastic sense of including rationalistic attitudes toward the Bible. As this is the popular use of the phrase and as the author is writing for the benefit of plain people who are necessarily unable to specialize in a scholastic fashion on scriptural study, it is not improper to expose the numerous errors in Modernism. But students should remember that rationalism which brings to the study of the Holy Book *a priori* philosophical presumptions is not criticism at all, but is as uncritical as the traditionalist assumption of mechanical inspiration. Real criticism is the attempt to so carefully examine the sacred writings that they can be made to answer for themselves questions as to date, authorship, composition, inspiration, etc.

It must also be noted that some of Doctor Fitchett's criticisms, such as that on Principal Griffith-Jones, are somewhat too drastic. Indeed, if we were to state in scientific terms his own Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, it would probably be found not very different from that of Peake or Griffith-Jones. Of course he differs from them in many details, but not so greatly in theory.

The above paragraphs must not be regarded as undervaluing this

book for popular use. Its pious emphasis on the constructive side of scholarship gives it exceedingly high worth for the use of timid folks who need to know what gains have come to faith from modern scholarship. This picture of some pathetic failures will give them courage. And it is also worth while for many preachers who are very superficial liberals to learn that preaching has to deal with those positive religious values which no criticism can eliminate from the Bible. In fact, this is an excellent attack on many features of so-called Modernism, which is often merely an attempt to substitute some phase of philosophy or science for Christianity. Much of it, such as Dean Inge's Platonism, is not modern in any sense. It might have been better if such words as Modernism and Rationalism were frequently substituted for Higher Criticism.

All scholars will agree with our author when he says: "The Higher Criticism, to sum up, is a perfectly legitimate branch of Bible Study; it has rendered at some points real and great service to the Christian faith, and may well continue to render that service." And all Christians will indorse this: "The divine book is not a fossil, the remains of some strange form of life dug up from ancient strata and on which geologists and antiquarians may hold learned debate, fitting bone to bone and reconstructing the living form. It is a living book. It has hands and feet and wings. It is 'quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow.' How can a problem in biology be settled by archeological or antiquarian guesses?"

The Theory of Ethics. By ARTHUR KENYON ROGERS. New York: The Macmillan Company.

THERE is a deal of difference between the satisfaction theory of theology and the satisfaction theory of ethics. The one majors in satisfaction to God; the other in satisfaction to man. But they have this in common: they frequently receive restatement. From time to time men arise to adorn one or the other of them with a new garment (sometimes merely redyed!) in the hope that the charm so added may make for acceptance. Arthur Kenyon Rogers' new book is an attempt to present ethics in this subtler form of hedonism, which by any other name smells as sweet or nauseating. His exposition is avowedly naturalistic. Those of us who have on our shelves his handy compendium *American and English Philosophy Since 1800* or any of this writer's previous output know that he is sure to be interesting even when he is far from convincing. Happy that preacher whose power of illustration approaches his. On the other hand many of his statements are brilliant rather than illuminating. Not infrequently his statements admit of various interpretations. Precision in speech is incumbent on us all, but when a philosopher fails here, he grievously wounds his cause.

There are nine chapters. One who reads the first three could guess pretty easily what the other six contain. He discusses the "Nature of Goodness," speaking of it as "*anything* we approve—the abstract charac-

ter, that is, of calling forth approval." Of "The Good and Pleasure" he asserts that "that is good which gives us pleasure when we think of it" (and not necessarily when we act). In his chapter on "Ethical Quality and the Ought" he makes much of "that æsthetic or semiæsthetic feeling of admiration." Throughout, he rings all the changes on these two words: Satisfaction, Admiration. Their ethical potency appears boundless to him. Thus when he comes to the "summum bonum" he says: "If my good is in terms of a satisfying life which takes account of all the real potentialities of my being, then the greatest good we can conceive will be the attainment of this same end by all possible beings who are of a nature capable of satisfaction." This may not be as clear as one could wish, but it suggests the idea that similarity, rather than development is at the heart of life. Other of his statements bear this out. Although "justified approval . . . implies a confidence that the way things appeal to human nature is somehow fundamental and central in the ultimate structure of the universe," "there is nothing to be gained by fitting our ideal to a world other than the one in which we live." Reading such words as these, Browning's statement about "a man's reach" and Jesus' insistence that we seek first the Realm of God rush to mind. No ethic will prove "satisfying" that does not posit *growth* as the end of living. The "vague generalities" concerning the Highest Good which this author decries have heartened those whom history honors most. Beholding the Invisible and "dwelling in tents . . . they looked for the city" of which not even Rand-McNally could draw the map. So unbiased a witness as Morris Jastrow long ago observed that on occasion "ethics becomes an offshoot of religion." Those who have eyes to see know that presently stewardship will change our business ethic as completely as men's reaction toward slavery has been changed.

But a book such as this one must read for oneself. One will find it hard to forgive the author for once again slaying those Kantian bogeys that so many essay to demolish. But all along this author makes you feel like arguing with him about really worthwhile things; you wonder why he did not think of so many things you think of as you follow his book. This is a capital book to read, provided you care to think.

JOHN M. VERSTEEG.

Jersey City, N. J.

The Moral Life and Religion. By JAMES TEN BROEK. New York: The Macmillan Company.

THIS is a book to be *studied*. One wishes it were also possible to say that this is a book to be *read*. Why do people who have good things to say insist on saying them poorly? Lynn Harold Hough once contrasted William James, a psychologist who writes like a novelist, to novelists who write like psychologists (and "get away with it!"). Some of our great thinkers do write engagingly. Recall Jay William Hudson's *The Truths We Live By*, or James Bissett Pratt's new *Matter and Spirit*, or John Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct*, or any book in which the mind of Bishop Mc-

Connell scintillates and invigorates. But here is a thinker whose rickety language jounces one's mind about. This is pity the more because he has many worthwhile things to say. He is the victim of a heavy vocabulary and so, of course, are his readers. He spurns short-cuts. There is something redolent of Calvinism in his perseverance in sentences. To the bitter end, he "piles it on." Here is one example, not extreme: "Plato and Aristotle suggested that the ideas existing in themselves, energize, realize themselves in the world of nature and spirit, but now we regard their ideas as related to ourselves as subjects who gradually render them more definite as ends by which we guide activity and experience their fulfillment as reality which in its turn develops." One turns the pages tremulously, never knowing but that on the next one there skulks some such sentence as this. If you are in search of something readable, you purchase to no purpose if you buy this book.

But if you wish to pay respect to your mind by thinking basic thoughts, by all means get this book, and manfully plow through its untoward utterances. For here is solid food (little dressing and no dessert). It is not so much that he confirms many Christian opinions, but that he renders that greater service of which Browning sensed the need: He "gives our conviction a clinch." But he does not do so in a tawdry way, nor in a brazen one. You will seek far and long to find Kant, Bergson, Lotze, Nietzsche or Ritschl discussed with more exquisite fairness. One comes from the reading of this book feeling that he has listened to an honest man. Withal, there is a sturdy advocacy of Christian views. He attempts less to make these appear reasonable than inevitable. Chapter 7, "Moral Significance of Social Organization," and Chapter 11, "The Practical Relation of Morality and Religion," are peculiarly thought-provoking.

His book has been written because "there is a tendency to abstract reality from experience" and also "to view reality as unchangeably permanent." He is more successful, and gives more space, in combating the former tendency than the latter. Yet, "because the objects of religious experience are empirically real, they may change through new and different experiences in which a new real is found or some modification of what was before occurs. . . . God's reality changes for us, but the change is that which is implied in our progress toward a constant end. Thus God is the beginning and goal of our life." "Our good . . . consists in becoming more truly persons with an increasing complexity and richness of experience, with definiteness of conditions, determined by this end."

JOHN M. VERSTEEG.

The Religion of Science. By WILLIAM HAMILTON WOOD. Pp. x+173. New York: The Macmillan Co. Price, \$1.50.

It is not William Jennings Bryan but Prof. William Hamilton Wood, of Dartmouth College, who has exposed the utter futility of the religion of science and of evolution. This does not mean that scientific men or

evolutionists cannot be Christians, but that they must get their religion from God and not from nature. Not in the laboratory but in the oratory will they find moral ideals and spiritual fellowship. Naturalistic and mechanistic theories of human life cannot solve its deepest problems.

Criticism may be allowed as to traditional religious records and beliefs, but it does not destroy the religion in them. But criticism applied to the evolutionary theory does not reveal in it any substantial contribution to religion. Religion is more than knowledge in the intellectual sense of the word; it is not a product of reason or scientific investigation. It is based on a personal acquaintance with God and consequent conquest of life. A scientific religion, if there could be such a thing, would be a religion for a select few only.

The fact is that religion, and not science, has both the first and the last word of life. It gave birth to both science and philosophy. It is the source and creator of final beliefs and knowledge. Thinking alone is not religious—not even thinking about God. It is the higher call of spiritual reality and obedience to it that alone serves man. Religion is not a by-product of the intellect; it is a force behind all thought and life.

To thus perfectly upset the modern attempt to find religion in scientific discovery, as Professor Wood has done in his book, is not to discount either science or the evolutionary theory, but to make them keep their own place in the mental life and not attempt to invade the spiritual and moral realm. It is a noble apologetic against all intellectual dogmatism. Perhaps more space should have been given to a constructive statement of what is the essence of Christianity and more emphasis placed on the fact that the metaphysical scientists, whom he criticises, have been simply trying to read Christian ideals into their scientific theories. Nevertheless, this is a new and original book, dealing in an absolutely fresh manner with a fundamental problem of the present age. Both scientists and theologians should read and ponder its teachings.

I Believe in God and Evolution. By WILLIAM W. KEEN, M.V. Pp. 100. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. Price, \$1.

No one could be better fitted to discuss the question than Doctor Keen, one of the greatest American surgeons and a most devout Christian. This man, who by urging the introduction of Listerism into American hospitals and surgical operations has influenced the saving of thousand of lives, should be listened to by those who find a discord between religion and evolution. He knows and loves his Bible and is able to show how completely science and Scripture harmonize in their fundamental teachings. He states in this lecture, delivered at the Crozier Theological Seminary (Baptist), the fact of evolution, based on comparative anatomy, rudimentary organs, embryology, pathological similarities, geological evidence, ethnology, etc., in simple terms that all can comprehend. That bodywise God has made man of the same stuff and on the same plane as the animals does not interfere with the Scripture teaching of his divinely imparted spiritual nature that man possesses. The faith that saves the soul is not

the biological creed either of Darwin or Bryan. But the latter loses much in learning by mixing up the two. It is a perilous thing to place such dogmatic obstacles in the path of men who know science. All honor to Doctor Keen, who has so thoroughly taken down the bars and so given students a chance to be religious and scholarly at the same time.

The Early Days of Christianity. By FREDERICK C. GRANT. Pp. 320. New York and Cincinnati: The Abingdon Press. Price, \$1.75, net.

The Apostolic Age. By WILLIAM BANCROFT HILL. Pp. 386. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, \$2, net.

NEITHER of these books is an elaborate treatise on the Apostolic Church and could not be substituted for such learned works as those of Weizsacker or McGiffert. But they are more fitted for class work in religious education. For this purpose that of Mr. Grant is much the better for younger classes, but by its vividness and its study suggestions. It carries the story from the ascension of our Lord to the reign of Constantine—the entire Ante-Nicene period.

Doctor Hill presents a very conservative treatment of New Testament literature. His highest value is the proper emphasis placed on the missionary spirit of the early church.

Every Christian should master two periods of church history—the first and his own. To know the beginnings will fortify faith and give inspiration for present duty.

Outspoken Essays (Second Series). By WILLIAM RALPH INGE, Dean of Saint Paul's. Pp. 275. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. Price, \$2.

DEAN INGE is one of the profound thinkers of our age, and to read his writing is excellent intellectual exercise. But it is best not to agree with his philosophical standpoint. He is a Neo-Platonist, dating mentally back as far as Plotinus. He has not acquired the critical mind that belongs to the Kantian school. It is this idealism that does not believe that moral and spiritual perfection can be realized in the actual world, which gives that slightly pessimistic tinge to his thought and has given him (quite improperly) the nickname of "The Gloomy Dean." Yet it is worth while to achieve his dream of an Invisible World of Ideas, if we can call it the kingdom of God and really believe that Our Lord's Prayer will be answered and his kingdom come and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

The first long essay, "Confessio Fidei," is a brilliant Platonizing of Christianity, with some sharp criticisms of traditionalism quite worth considering. But his results are more Greek and less Christian than the opinions of Clement of Alexandria, that great Greek Father. One should read to balance this exaggerated intellectualism that greatest handbook on the subject, Hatch's *Influence of Greek Thought on Christianity* and the first volume of Harnack's *History of Dogma*.

The same atmosphere should be used while reading the second essay, "The State Visible and Invisible." It is a noble ideal to say "there can be no durable and valuable coherence in the State Visible except so far as its members are also members of the State Invisible." But we must ask this question: Is our religion never to be so fully applied to politics, business, or social life, that the unseen Kingdom shall become an outward one and this bad world be turned into a good world? To answer this affirmatively would be to avoid the gloom of the next essay, "The Idea of Progress."

"The Victorian Age" is one of the finest evaluations yet made of that period. With cool, candid, and correct criticism he notes the moral elements of that age, and our "Young Intellectuals," whose flapper-faces are painted with ignorant pride, would do well to wipe off their superficial sneer at the Victorians with this clear water.

The last three essays, "The White Man and His Rivals," "The Dilemma of Civilization," and "Eugenics," are too much influenced by the racial prejudices of some modern biologists. If the latter would study psychology more and be a bit more brotherly toward souls for whom Christ died, we would be saved a lot of recent snobbery. Scientific theories should be applied (if we can be sure of their truth) to shaping the social order. But eugenics and birth-control will do far less to counteract race deterioration than the grace of God and Christian love. The real salvation of society comes from above by an invasion of spiritual forces. Yet, in spite of this necessary censorship, Dean Inge is greatly worth reading.

The Church and the Ever Coming Kingdom of God. By ELIJAH E. KRESGE. Pp. xiv + 316. New York: Macmillan Company. Price, \$2.25.

HERE is another to be added to that growing list of books that seek to interpret the task of the church in terms of the social order. The author considers his theme against the background of modern biblical study and the findings of modern science.

The point of view as well as the moral passion of the book are indicated by such passages as the following: "The creation of a really Christian public sentiment in favor of steady employment and an efficient-living income for all honest citizens would be a more legitimate and effective piece of evangelism than the calling of a professional evangelist or the holding of prayer meetings to pray for the coming of the Kingdom." "I refuse to cast the first stone at the man who uses the tithe of a \$600 or \$700 income to buy an extra bottle of milk for his babies or a new hat for his wife, rather than give it to the church." "If the soft-handed rich and their hireling supporters, who have never shed an honest drop of sweat in their life, would be obliged to dig coal under the ground, or stand beside the molten lead in a blast furnace, for eight hours a day and six days a week, for seventy cents an hour, every one of them would become an ardent unionist within six months, and they would be among the first to vote for a strike for a six hour day, a five and a half day week, and one dollar an hour pay."

The preacher who is acquainted with the literature of social Christianity in its modern interpretation, from Rauschenbusch, by whose spirit and point of view the author has been greatly influenced, to that significant report of the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook "The Church and Industrial Reconstruction," which the author does not mention, will find little that is new or suggestive here. But one whose chief reading has been in some other field may find the book a sympathetic and helpful approach to a consideration of the social task of the church.

WINIFRED CHAPPELL.

TEN BOOKS ON PREACHING

That the Ministry Be Not Blamed. By JOHN A. HUTTON, D.D. New York: Hodder and Stoughton. Price, \$1.50.

The Art of Preaching. By CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$1.75.

The Freedom of the Preacher. By WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$1.25.

Preaching and Sermon Construction. By PAUL B. BULL, M.A. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$2.50.

The Art of Preaching in the Light of Its History. By EDWIN CHARLES DARGAN. New York: George H. Doran Company. Price, \$1.75.

The Hebrew Prophet and the Modern Preacher. By H. J. PICKETT. New York: George H. Doran Company. Price, \$2.

Types of Preachers in the New Testament. By A. T. ROBERTSON, LL.D. New York: George H. Doran Company. Price, \$1.75.

Homiletics. A manual of the Theory and Practice of Preaching. By PROFESSOR M. REU, D.D. Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House. Price, \$2.

Preaching as a Fine Art. By ROLAND COTTON SMITH, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, 75 cents.

The Christian Message and Other Lectures. By JAMES IVERACH, D.D. New York: George H. Doran Company. Price, \$2.50.

PREACHING will never grow out of date so long as man continues to influence his fellowmen through the living voice. The word preaching is often used in an elastic sense of all utterances that express convictions or surmisings from the platform, through the press and in the pulpit. Such a general understanding of the preaching office is no doubt justifiable. "There are many kinds of voices in the world," says Paul, "and no kind is without signification" (1 Cor. 14. 10). The important question, however, relates to the substance of the message, which determines the character of the preaching.

Christian preaching has to do with the gospel of Jesus Christ. If we restrict it to what is said by the man in the pulpit, it is not because of any claim to monopoly but to concentrate our thought for the present

to one of the distinctive ministries of the church. Any attempt to minimize it or to set it in a lower place than it has held in the estimation of the church would spell disaster to the cause of Christianity. On the other hand, every effort to understand the conspicuous significance of this calling, to reassure us of its indispensable worth, and to increase its scope and power, would bring in a better spirit of appreciation of the demands made on the preacher and encourage him to meet them.

They who know most about preaching are the practitioners of this superb art, who maintain an open mind for the discovery of truth and cultivate a growing sensitiveness to the winds of the Divine Spirit that have blown over the centuries and still continue to fructify and refresh mankind. Such men do not suffer from "intellectual frugality" or spiritual paucity of resource, but give proof of being reputable dispensers of "the unsearchable riches of Christ." The following books meet this test in varying degrees of acceptability.

Those who have read Dr. Hutton's stimulating volumes of sermons and essays will understand why in these lectures on preaching he lays the greatest emphasis on what the preacher should say. It is therefore most pathetic and tragic when he is concerned with answering questions that no one is putting, and talks about trivial things and minor matters with insufferable tediousness. He should have "a background of sound thinking and sincere unforced imagination, and a certain saneness and inevitableness of appeal such as shall dispose able and serious and disquieted men to consider anew the proposal of our Lord, which it is the decisive function of his church to recall to the mind and conscience of men that it may not die, and that man may not finally fail" (p. 192). This is the gist of a strong argument for responsibilities that no preacher could disregard.

Dean Brown has a genius for preaching. The ripe experience of thirty-three years of successful pulpit work in Methodism and Congregationalism is given in these Yale lectures. He combines theory with practice in a most attractive way, and his points are forcibly made with illustrations from his varied activities as pastor and professor. The purpose of pulpit ministration is to make people immediately conscious of the presence of God in Christ. What he writes about expository preaching is most timely. No one has demonstrated its superior qualities better than Dean Brown, in his previous course of Yale lectures on *The Social Message of the Modern Pulpit* and in other writings. This is one of the best books on the making and giving of a sermon.

Doctor Merrill of the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City, understands thoroughly, sees clearly and speaks wisely of the work of the Christian minister. His freedom is determined by the obligations and limitations of his calling, well expressed in Bergson's sentence that "life is freedom, inserting itself within necessity, and turning it to its profit." Those who declare that independence and initiative are hampered in the ministry should read these Yale lectures and disabuse their minds of the cant that parades in the guise of liberty. Dr. Merrill knows all about our difficulties, but he is not disconcerted. This is one of the most

sensible books on the work of the minister, as prophet, preacher, priest, churchman, administrator, interpreter of the social and the world order, who finds and expresses his freedom in Christ.

After taking exception to Mr. Bull's sacramentarianism and to certain offensive remarks on Protestantism, his volume could be heartily commended as one of the best manuals on preaching. He writes with the enthusiasm of conviction and the reader feels the thrill that stirs this writer. The chapters on "Prophet and Priest," "The Preacher's Aim," "The Preacher's Life," "The Immediate Preparation," "Dialectic," "Rhetoric," "The Enrichment of the Sermon" are full of wisdom and insight. The last chapter on "Sectional Addresses" takes up the personal problems of men, women and youth with searching directness. The young preacher who heeds these counsels would be warned against what one has described as "a rambling and incoherent sermon, interspersed with trite observations and conventional platitudes." There are copious extracts from different writers on various phases of the subject.

What is the testimony of the centuries to the virtue of preaching? Doctor Dargan gives the answer in a splendid historical survey. In a sense this is a digest of his two large volumes on *A History of Preaching*. In this brief historical résumé, special attention is given to the explanation and application of homiletical principles, as these were used by the great preachers. The preacher of to-day is in a truly noble succession. He should dignify his calling by becoming more proficient and efficient, as did the noble men mentioned in these stimulating pages.

What the Fernley lecture is in Wesleyan Methodism that the Hartley lecture is in Primitive Methodism. Some fine volumes have been published in connection with this latter foundation. One of the latest was *The Revelation of John* by Professor A. S. Peake. The present volume by William Pickett maintains the high grade of Christian scholarship. The first part is a comprehending and discerning study of Hebrew prophecy. The second part deals with Christian preaching as the prophetic declaration of the gospel of redemption. It is just the kind of book that American preachers would welcome.

Professor Robertson has taught about five thousand preachers during a period of thirty-five years. His sympathetic solicitude for the average man and his deep understanding of his needs, are finely revealed in these studies of the lesser known characters of the New Testament. Some of the temptations common to preachers are squarely faced in the chapter on "Judas the Traitor of Our Lord." If "Diotrephes the Church Regulator" is a type of layman, who has made life miserable for preachers, "Lydia the Preacher's Friend and Helper" is one of those gracious types whose influence has been a benediction.

Professor Reu covers the entire realm of homiletics in this discussion of the preaching office. At times he yields to the professorial weakness of dogmatism and some of his criticisms of fellow-teachers are in poor taste. The book, however, is a valuable contribution toward a knowledge of the Lutheran type of sermon, which lays more stress on confessional preaching. Each of the chapters is prefaced with a full bibliog-

raphy, in which continental authors are conspicuous. There are also extensive quotations from every school of homiletical thought.

The sermon is a means to the end. The preacher with a vivid personal experience of God will create the atmosphere of faith, and, in the spirit of the genuine artist, he will fashion the nature of his hearers into the likeness of Jesus Christ. Doctor Smith stimulatingly develops this thought in two lectures, which help the preacher to give a definite answer to the oft-repeated question, "What is God like?"

The recent death of Principal Iverach at the advanced age of eighty-three years removed one of the keenest theologians of the Christian Church. As a mediator between science and religion, his *Christianity and Evolution*, and *Is God Knowable?* proved unsurpassed ability. His last volume is included here on account of the first five lectures on preaching, viewed in its relation to the personality and message of the preacher. The remaining seventeen addresses and essays are on subjects of interest to the preacher. One quotation must be made from the sermon on "Truthing It in Love," preached in Saint Giles' Cathedral before the University of Edinburgh. "The test of life differs greatly from the academic test, yet the one should prepare for the other; keep that disinterested love for the ideal which has been fostered here; keep that recognition of the necessities which guard belief and thought and action; maintain in all their freshness, purity, and luster, those high hopes and great ideals which are your possession to-day; descend not to second-rate ideals of life or work, which are absolutely fatal to both. Never let work out of your hands less well done than you can do. Never say to yourself, this is not up to the mark, this is not so well done as I could have done it, had I taken more pains, but it will do, it will pass" (p. 317). This is bracing counsel for workers in every field of activity.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

The Idea of God. By C. A. BECKWITH. Pp. xlii+343. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922. Price, \$2.50.

THERE continues to be a steady output of good books on the perennial problem of the nature and purpose of God, and the reasons we have for believing in him. W. E. Hocking, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, Pringle-Pattison, *The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy*, and W. R. Sorley, *Moral Values and the Idea of God*, take high rank among such books. To these one may add without hesitation this last book of Professor Beckwith. For the student who desires to be made acquainted with the long course of theistic discussion, and with the form that theistic belief is taking at the present time, it is perhaps the most valuable of the four. Hocking's is greater in sheer power of thought, but it is concerned chiefly with one particular theory, and it is marred by an exceedingly difficult style. Pringle-Pattison's is greater in critical acumen, in mastery of the material, and in argumentative force. Sorley's is greater in sustained power of reasoning, and in the elucidation of what is implied in the fact of moral value. But the appeal of all three books

is primarily to the professional student of the subject. The value of Beckwith's book is in the fact that it puts within reach of the working pastor and the interested layman the best historic and contemporary thought on this vital question of belief in God. The style is clear and not too technical; the arrangement is simple and orderly; and while there is necessarily much criticism, the book nowhere shows any controversial bitterness.

Professor Beckwith is wholly a modern man. He takes for granted the modern view of things. It is just because he does this that he feels that the theistic faith needs to be restated. He is as remorseless as Kant in his rejection of the traditional "proofs." The position maintained is frankly that of an ethical monotheism, but this is not held to require that we cling to outworn speculations concerning the Absolute which spring rather from a metaphysical than from a religious interest. Professor Beckwith thinks that it is no longer possible to retain the old scheme of a God living from eternity in self-contained and self-sufficing bliss, who finally decides to create a world for the manifestation of his power and glory. God is conceived as the "Creative Good Will," who is that by his very nature, who has always been that, who therefore is not to be separated from his own activity, and whose nature and character are to be inferred from those "ends" which his activity is obviously intended to realize. Our chief reason for believing in such a God is our very experience of his purposive activity. The belief, however, is not one that we are forced to, whether or no. Professor Beckwith's method is pragmatic, and pragmatism involves the will to believe. "The idea of God as a Purposive Will may be true, and if so, is worthy to command the supreme devotion of the human will. It can be known to be true only if in response to that devotion it proves itself valid by filling life with a divine content and eternal meaning" (p. 306).

Modern thinking is emphasizing the purposiveness of life, the continuous emergence of the new, the permanence of the idea of value, personal and social, the variability of the content of the value-idea, and the spirit of Jesus as the criterion by which God and man and the nature of the Supreme Good and the Chief End are to be judged. Professor Beckwith attempts to state the idea of God in keeping with these various points of view.

One of the least satisfactory parts of the book is the discussion of the personality of God. One feels that it is the *term* that is being retained rather than that which the term must be properly held to connote. The author's claim is that the conception of Divine Personality is to be reached not by an analysis of what personality is supposed essentially to be, but by an understanding of the character of the ends which are disclosed in the universe, and which we must suppose are being sought by God and therefore are the index to his nature. The principle adopted is that that is personal which seeks personal ends. It would seem that the next step is obvious, namely, the assertion that such ends as Truth and Beauty and Goodness, which are plainly sought in the universe, require a God who is able to conceive them, to be interested in them, and to plan for their

realization. It is difficult to see why there should be any hesitation in attributing to such a God "self-hood, self-consciousness, self-control, and power to know" (cf. p. 301).

On the whole, however, the book is eminently constructive. The closing chapter on "The Living God," with its discussion of certain practical features of belief, may be read with great profit again and again. Take, for example, this statement on prayer: "The first condition of fruitful prayer is to accept the world we live in, in every way to strive to ascertain the meaning of it and how to realize its ends—and this is the function of prayer—and then with heart and soul give oneself to the furthering of the Divine Will in which alone our wish comes to its consummation" (p. 328). Or this: "When the shadow falls and sorrow and loss have darkened all our world and we sit alone and disconsolate by the ashes of our hope, we may still recall the light and joy of other days; we may comfort our hearts with the assurance that the world as it is created by a Good Will, wiser than our wisdom, more just than our measuring-rod of right, more tender than our gentlest compassion, and more worthy of our trust than all our imperfect conceptions of His goodness. . . . In this confidence we go forward to meet what life has to offer, even its sorrow and loss, safe in the will of the Living God" (p. 335). It is thus that the book ends. While it can nourish such a faith as that, theology will not be without justification.

EDWIN LEWIS.

Drew Theological Seminary.

Character and Opinion in the United States. By GEORGE SANTAYANA, Late Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$3.50.

Soliloquies in England and Later Soliloquies. By GEORGE SANTAYANA. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$3.50.

"GEORGE SANTAYANA's lack of influence in proportion to the weight of his contribution to philosophical sanity and clarity, perhaps due in part to the academic distrust of literary gifts, is also not unconnected with a tone of condescension which he is apt to adopt toward competing views, as calling rather for indulgence than for serious argument. In consequence his work is more impressive as an imaginative picture of a certain outlook on the spiritual life of man, than for its explicit dialectical grounding." So writes Professor Arthur Kenyon Rogers in his recent *English and American Philosophy Since 1800* (p. 351).

There is a certain aloofness, not without sympathy, in Santayana's attitude. This is evidenced in these two volumes which interpret American and English life more discerningly than many recent impressionistic sketches. He looks beneath the surface and beyond the passing show and reports favorably, with suggestions that contemplate better things. As a student, instructor and professor in Harvard University, he enjoyed the friendship of leaders of thought in the United States and in other lands.

He therefore writes as a citizen of the Republic of Learning. His estimates of character and opinion are profoundly persuasive though not always complimentary. The titles of the chapters of his book on the United States are: "The Moral Background," "The Academic Environment," "William James," "Josiah Royce," "Later Speculations," "Materialism and Idealism in American Life," "English Liberty in America." His conclusion is that "American life is free as a whole, because it is mobile, because every atom that swims in it has a momentum of its own which is felt and respected throughout the mass, like the weight of an atom in the solar system, even if the deflection it may cause is infinitesimal. In temper America is docile and not at all tyrannical; it has not predetermined its career and its merciless momentum is a passive resultant" (p. 211).

He believes that the leveling tendency of English liberty is seen to greater advantage in America than in England itself. What he means by this is set forth in *Soliloquies*, written with a detachment, free from illusions and with an eagerness that is decidedly appreciative. There is a quiet serenity in his observations, and, ever and anon, he takes issue with the idealistic philosophy because it cuts loose from reality. The chapter on "Dickens" is about the richest, but this is only another way of saying that this book is an accurate portrayal of English life and manners. It should be read not only by those who have a warm place in their heart for England but by all who would know the secret of a nation which is the leading custodian of the world's liberty. Since the peace of the world depends on Anglo-American friendship and cooperation, let all students read both these books.

The fundamental criticism of such writers as Santayana and Dean Inge is that they are still under the tyranny of the Greek absolute. A little less Platonism and a bit more Pragmatism would enliven both of them.

A Short History of the World. By H. G. WELLS. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$4.

Two years after *The Outline of History*, which was noticed in the *METHODIST REVIEW* for September, 1921, Mr. Wells with amazing industry and ability offers this new history. It is not an abstract of the larger work but written afresh for a more general public, without notes and discussions. It is a panoramic survey and very readable. It is almost in the style of a novel. The series of cameo sketches could hardly be excelled. The characterizations are swift but lucid and the conclusions are impressive though not always convincing.

Mr. Wells follows the history through the centuries in three hundred and eighty-five pages, filled with illustrations, after having disposed of the ages before man's advent in forty-two pages. He leaps from one country to another and from one period to its successor, with the agility of a trained mental athlete. Throughout the history we see the progress of ideas making for the greater freedom of the human mind and spirit.

Some epochs were more significant than others, as for instance the sixth century B. C. What he writes of the Hebrew prophets is the more striking, when placed in the entire context of the movement for religious and social liberty. These men marked "the appearance of a new power in the world, the power of individual moral appeal, of an appeal to the free conscience of mankind against the fetish sacrifices and slavish loyalties that had hitherto bridled and harnessed our race" (p. 126). That the Punic Wars were called forth by a struggle between Aryan and Semite, which has continued through the centuries, is a new reading of the inevitable clash between divergent ideals and temperaments, in which religion has had no small part.

This history does justice to the common man. Carlyle's theory of the strong man finds no support, and rightly so. To be sure, there are omissions and mistakes but in no other book is the story of the human race correlated and narrated quite as suggestively. The conclusion is optimistic. "Man is still only adolescent. His troubles are not the troubles of senility and exhaustion but of increasing and still undisciplined strength. What man has done, the little triumphs of his present state, and all this history we have told, form but the prelude to the things that man has got to do" (p. 427). Thank you, Mr. Wells, for the assurance that it is to be better farther on. We therefore thank God and take courage.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

Jesus as Judged by His Enemies. By JAMES H. SNOWDEN (The Abingdon Press, \$1.75). The favorable testimony of friends is encouraging, but that of opponents is wonderfully reassuring. This book brings together the hostile criticisms, prejudiced judgments and shortsighted charges of the enemies of Jesus, which Doctor Snowden points out were really compliments unwittingly paid to the Master. This original study of the Gospels furnishes an impressive apologetic for the sublime character of our Saviour.

What is There in Religion? By HENRY SLOANE COFFIN (Macmillan, \$1.25). Using the Hudson River as a parable Doctor Coffin shows in a series of interesting chapters that, just as this river imparts benefits to the land through which it flows, so religion gives us refreshment, cleansing, power, illumination, fertility, buoyancy, serenity, adventure, beauty, unity, permanence. This is a novel treatment of the spiritual wealth and sufficiency obtained through the companionship of Jesus.

The Four Gospels. By J. M. FULLER, M.A. (Macmillan, \$1). This harmony follows the Authorized Version. Since Mark was used by the other two Synoptists it would have been better if it was placed in the first column. The four maps illustrating the journeys of Jesus are a decided help.

Christianity and Problems of To-day (Scribners, \$1.25). These dis-

cursive lectures on the Bross Foundation endeavor to relate current problems to the teaching of Jesus. They do not offer any new contribution to our knowledge of the subject and merely reiterate what is virtually acknowledged by every one.

The Son of Man Coming in His Kingdom. By ALFRED GANDIER, LL.D. (Doran, \$1.25). Principal Gandier of Knox College, Toronto, interprets the coming of Christ not as a specific event, as the literalists maintain, but as a historical process, looking toward a final consummation when God shall be all and in all. Those who seek to be convinced of the larger truth rather than to be confirmed in foregone conclusions will find this book worth while.

Bible and Spade. By JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D. (Scribners, \$1.75). Archaeological research has confirmed the historicity of the Bible and helped to a clearer understanding of many passages which were unintelligible for lack of facts. Doctor Peters writes out of a full knowledge and with an enthusiasm born of extensive exploration and excavation. It is the one book to read for up-to-date information and for luminous interpretations of both Old and New Testaments. An index of Scripture references would have increased the value of this welcome guide book. Many fine photographs are reproduced.

Some Things that Matter. By LORD RIDDELL (Doran, \$2). In a genial and colloquial manner, Lord Riddell offers counsels on reading, observing, concentrating, public speaking, thinking, weighing evidence. Such a book is a decidedly helpful manual for all who seek self-improvement. The preacher could not do a better service than to encourage his young people to read it. In fact, the second half of the book should be read by everybody, to guard against the quakeries of vagrant thought and shallow nostrums that misguide the unwary and deceive the credulous.

The New Testament. Parallel Edition. By JAMES MOFFATT, Litt.D. (Doran, Four editions ranging in prices from \$2.50 to \$6). The New Translation by Professor Moffatt first appeared in 1913. It has justified itself as a welcome version of the New Testament in modern English of the best available Greek text. The present edition places the Authorized Version and Moffatt's translation side by side. The reader could thus see at a glance the differences between the two and have a better understanding of their common aim, which is to make clearer and more compelling the voice of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. An extended Introduction discusses questions of criticism and translation which every student will want to read.

Spiritual Energies in Daily Life. By RUFUS M. JONES, Litt.D. (Macmillan, \$1.50). Another book on the deeper realities of Christian experience by the leading American authority on mysticism. Our troubles are due to failure to live at the center and to keep in communion with the Source of divine power. These meditations show the better way of

realizing the inward renewal of life, that helps us to counteract the moral upheaval, to supply the spiritual emptiness and to possess contentment and peace in Christ.

Man and the Two Worlds: a Layman's Idea of God. By WILLIAM FREDERICK DIX and RANDALL SALISBURY. Pp. xii+177. (Harper and Brothers, \$1.50). These two university-bred business men have from their boyhood discussed together religious and philosophical subjects. After a long struggle with the age-long problem of evil, they have reached a supposed solution in an interesting form of dualism. There are two worlds—a spiritual world of which God is Maker and Ruler and a dead stodgy material universe that an infinitely good God could not have created. Evil is simply caused by man ignoring the spiritual and surrendering to the physical side of life. Very clever, but—it ignores the fact that moral empire is more certainly established when we have a God who, by self-limitation of his infinitude, will not use force to create righteousness. This may not solve all problems, but it is better to untie knots than to cut them. Yet it was good for these two men to think out these questions; they may not have reached the correct theological answer but they have certainly enriched their own souls religiously.

The Dramatic Instinct in Religious Education. By THOS. W. GALLOWAY. Pp. 115. (Pilgrim Press, \$1.75). The story and the play are of first importance in the process of education. This is a useful handbook in the dramatic method and shows how churches can construct their own biblical dramas. Five well wrought examples are given in this book, two from New Testament parables and three from Old Testament stories. Dr. Galloway is an efficient master in pedagogy.

Who's Who in the Universe? By JAMES ROBERT GETTYS. Pp. 116. (The Abingdon Press, \$1). Who's who? not brawn, bullion, or even brain, except at its best, is sovereign in the world. Not by scales, or tape measures, or by dollars, can man be measured but by the golden reed of the heavenly sanctuary. The supreme values are not quantitative but qualitative. And the mind that shall make to-morrow is not the pagan intellect of the "Young Intellectuals" but the Higher Mind that comes from God. The real Superman is God's man. A fine book for young folks and others.

The Meaning of the Cross. By EDWARD GRUBB. Pp. 157 (Doran, \$1.50, net). In the London Times Literary Supplement is the following excellent analysis of this work: "Mr. Grubb, one of the most influential of religious writers in the Society of Friends, gives here a useful summary of the meaning and doctrine of Atonement in the Old and New Testaments, in medieval, reformation and modern times. A last chapter suggests the factors of what Mr. Grubb thinks must be the true solution of the problem—his view being in some ways a development of the Abelardian doctrine, revolutionary in the twelfth century, which rejected the ransom theory in favor of the moral influence theory. But Mr. Grubb adapts it

to modern thought—to scientific psychology, to Ritschl's insistence on a solution that is social; and comprising in the conception of Atonement the revelation of the character of God, our identification with his will, deliverance from sin rather than from punishment, and salvation by God's gift of love to us."

Handbook for Workers with Young People. By JAMES V. THOMPSON (The Abingdon Press, \$1.25). A splendid ideal is outlined in this book of practical suggestions. The attention is focused on the Sunday school, which is regarded as the preeminent agency for training young people. One of our misfortunes, no doubt, is the excessive overlapping in church work; but the frequent references to the young people's department should have included fuller mention of the Epworth League. A preacher is quoted as saying that "the most effective evangelistic force in our church is the cabinet of our young people's department" (p. 204). Is this not the Epworth League? If this organization had done nothing else but conduct the recent summer institutes, its existence would be amply justified. There should have been a chapter on how to correlate the existing societies of the church at work among the young people.

Citizen, Jr. By CLARA EWING ESPEY. Pp. 206 (The Abingdon Press, \$1.25).

Christian Citizenship. By FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL. Pp. 93 (The Methodist Book Concern, 75 cents, net). It is not possible to adequately review Bishop McConnell's book. No better text-book on religion in its relation to civics is available. A Young America, trained in these high ideals of the social and economic order, would lead to a transformed world. The needs of a social gospel, the rights and duties of citizenship, the problems of labor, health and morals, Americanization and world citizenship—all are treated with full freedom, absolute sanity, and in the atmosphere of the kingdom of God. It is admirably arranged as a study-book with excellently stated questions for thought and discussion. Miss Espey's book is admirably adapted for children and is written in much the same spirit.

Our Protestant Heritage. By W. WOFFORD T. DUNCAN. Pp. 130 (The Methodist Book Concern, \$1, net). These three noble sermons discuss ably the intellectual, moral, and spiritual heritage of Protestantism. And they present the argument not by K. K. K. methods (which are not Protestant but Romanist in their spirit) but in a sane, sound, and kindly way. Protestantism stands for political, intellectual, and spiritual liberty. It welcomes criticism as Rome does not. Doctor Duncan, by these discourses, rendered a high religious service in Pittsburgh at a critical moment of religious conflict. His ironic messages are mightier in their power than invective can ever be. They not only furnish matter, they suggest true method to our preachers and everybody.

The Ideals of France. By CHARLES CESTRE. Pp. 325 (The Abingdon Press, \$2, net). The world owes much to France. These Bennett lec-

tures delivered at the Wesleyan University reveal richly the contributions she has made to the ideals of mankind. And there is a far more lovable France than that sometimes disclosed in its political leadership. For it has given us faith and chivalry, ideals of equality and solidarity, contributions to culture, and progressive idealism—all of which are more than her own—they are her gift to humanity. Professor Cestre, of the Sorbonne, has charmingly unveiled the fairest features of France. They are worth looking at.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of the more important of these books may be fully reviewed in the future.)

A Harmony of the Gospels. By A. T. ROBERTSON (Doran, \$2.50, net). A thorough revision with added up-to-date material of Broadus' *Harmony*.

In the Footsteps of the Master. By J. H. MASTERMAN (Macmillan). Sermon Outlines on the Gospel of Mark—104 of them in 125 pages!

The Evangelistic Cyclopedia. By G. B. F. HALLOCK (Doran, \$3, net). Full of texts and themes for revivals, but no adequate program for training in personal work.

Bible Types of Modern Women. By W. MACKINTOSH MACKAY (Doran, \$1.50, net). The author of that excellent book, *The Disease and Remedy of Sin*, admirably portrays Bible women in the light of to-day.

The Great Evangelistic Opportunity. By JOHN WALTON (The John C. Winston Co., 75 cents). The child is the supreme opportunity of the church. Saved childhood will bring a saved world.

Self-healing Simplified. By GEORGE LANDON PERIN (Doran, \$1.50, net). A very thorough and quite interesting statement of cure by Autosuggestion from the religious standpoint. But diet and doctor must not be neglected.

Syllabus for Old Testament Study. By JOHN R. SANKEY (Doran, \$2, net). A good book for yesterday but not now.

Yellow Butterflies. By MARY RAYMOND SHIPMAN ANDREWS (Scribners, 75 cents). A touching tribute to the Unknown American Soldier in the form of a beautifully told story of a mother who imaginatively identifies him with her missing boy.

Via Sacra. By T. H. MARLOW (Hodder & Stoughton). Very edifying expositions on many themes.

The Epistles of Saint John. By H. PAKENHAM-WALSH (S. P. C. K.). This volume in the Indian Church Commentaries is scholarly in its exegesis and devout in exposition.

Real Religion. By GIPSY SMITH (Doran, \$1.35, net).

The Gospel of Sovereignty. By J. D. JONES (Doran, \$1.75, net). Great sermons by one of England's greatest preachers.

Ecclesiastes. By A. LARKIN WILLIAMS (Macmillan). This volume in the Cambridge Bible for schools and colleges is a necessary supplement to Plumptre's *Ecclesiastes* in the same series. Nothing better.

The Living Christ and the Four Gospels. By R. W. DALE (Doran, \$1.25, net). A reprint of a notable book published more than thirty years ago. Its value endures.

The Settlement Horizon. A National Estimate. By ROBERT A. WOODS and ALBERT J. KENNEDY (Russell Sage Foundation, \$3, net). Probably the best text-book existing for the settlement movement. It is more than a sociological treatise—it is rich in human interest and in suggestion for the social and recreational work of the church.

A READING COURSE

The Epistle to the Hebrews. Its Doctrine and Significance. By E. F. SCOTT, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$3.

THERE were many strands of thought and experience in the apostolic church. Divers accents and emphases were both tolerated and welcomed, provided the differences were subservient to the fundamental acceptance of the sublimely central leadership of Jesus Christ. The New Testament writings are not dogmatic declarations but dynamic expositions of the great verities. They took cognizance of the varieties of temperament and opinion, and reckoned with the principle of development in the conception and power of the evangel, as attempts were made to meet the needs of Judaism, of paganism, and of the growing Christian consciousness.

These writings might be divided according to types of thought and experience. The *ethical* type is represented by the Synoptic Gospels, the Epistles of James and of Peter; the *evangelical*, by the Epistles of Paul; the *intellectual*, by the Epistle to the Hebrews; the *mystical*, by the Apocalypse, the Epistles of John and Jude, and the Fourth Gospel. And yet none of these were exclusive, for the distinctive elements of each were also measurably found in all. Here, then, is the glory of Christ, that in him all types found holy unity. The New Testament is an apologetic not so much in defense of Christianity as an interpretation of it. It was addressed primarily to Christian communities, to clarify their thought, to remove misunderstandings, to suggest the relation between essentials and incidentals in doctrine, to establish and apply the permanent principles by which Jew and Gentile, bond and free, proletariat bourgeoisie and aristocrat, educated and unlearned, might find a common ground for the practice of Christian virtues, in the unity of the Spirit of Christ, the bond of perfectness.

We are accustomed to think of Paul and John as exercising a monopoly of influence in the early church. As a matter of fact there were Christian communities, independent of these two leaders, among whom free speculation was practiced, more especially after the early days of enthusiasm had passed. These stressed the importance of gnosis, and al-

though it was fraught with danger, as we know from the history of gnosticism, "it brought a wealth of new ideas and principles into Christian theology." This significant movement is represented by the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Parousia hopes were not realized and apocalyptic beliefs did not appeal to this class of Christians. There was, moreover, a decay of faith and earnestness under the pressure of trials, and the Christian appeals, effectual in the preceding generation, failed to quicken a response from them. They had lost their grip and were in danger of being completely bowled over. It is to them that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written. This letter of enlightenment, encouragement, and exhortation expressed the conviction that Christianity, however noble its past, has not yet run its course and that it has a peculiarly timely message for the perplexed mind and the distressed spirit. We are in a similar dilemma, so that the study of this Epistle, with the aid of Professor Scott's able volume, will help us to meet our own issues. We do not agree with him that the Epistle was addressed to a gentile community and not to one composed largely of Jewish Christians. We are not convinced that this unknown author minimized the distinction between Judaism and Christianity. But more germane to our purpose is the general trend of Doctor Scott's exposition that bears on our necessities. Read his chapter on "The Historical and Religious Value of the Epistle."

This Epistle has manifest limitations. The omissions were doubtless occasioned by a desire for simplification. "We miss the magnificent freshness and ardor of Paul." The writer does not enlarge upon "the essential newness of Christianity," because when he wrote Christianity had been established, although in comparison with the prevalent religions it was only of yesterday. The point he emphasized was not as to newness but genuineness, which proved its providential adaptation to every condition. He concentrated on a few matters which had relevancy to the spiritual needs of his readers and omitted other important questions that did not bear on the causes of their disillusionment and uncertainty. A preacher need not furnish a whole system of theology in every sermon, nor is it a sign of wisdom when he answers questions that no one is asking, because they bear on dead issues. It requires courage and the originality of independent thinking to adjust one's message to new needs without modifying the accepted fundamentals of the church. One who undertakes this may be exposed to the charge of inconsistency. The writer of this Epistle found it both compatible and congenial, and withal mandatory, to have affinities with Primitive Christianity and Alexandrian thought. So also does the modern preacher accept the conclusions of science without feeling that they militate in the least against the essential truth as it is in Jesus (Eph. 4. 21). This early writer took his stand on current beliefs but developed larger conclusions from them. "He was anxious to discover new possibilities, new reaches of truth, in the message that had come down to him, but only on the condition that the message itself was to stand unchallenged" (p. 76). His constant appeal is to go on to perfection, for it is better farther on (Ch. 6. 1).

The period was one of the most critical in all the history of the

church, probably second only to that through which we are passing. This letter is the chief witness to the feeling of spiritual exhaustion which had overtaken the church, as the century drew toward its close. It has been well said that, "construction is harder than criticism, though criticism is always popular." This unknown thinker, who is the connecting link between Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel, gave himself to the difficult task of construction. He looked through the flames in which Church and State were being consumed together and boldly declared that the rocks were not burning and showed no signs of passing away. As Professor Rendell Harris put it: "The situation was not a call to fear but to faith and to the reception of grace, fresh and new grace, whereby they may under new conditions serve God and adorn his gospel."

There have been other critical periods in the history of the church, when the foundations were apparently giving way. It was due to the Christian thinkers that the church was rescued from lapsing into a state of sheer inertia. In the fifth century, Augustine set forth a Christian philosophy of history in his *Civitas Dei*. In the fourteenth century, Dante expounded the thought of an international empire based on love and brotherhood in *De Monarchia*, at a time when both Church and State were suffering from decadence. Bishop Butler's *Analogy of Religion* was written to meet the cynical scepticism of the eighteenth century. By compelling the thoughtful to reckon with Christianity, the lonely thinker in Durham Castle, who stood outside the evangelical movement, nevertheless prepared the way for it. These three typical utterances, and more might be added if space permitted, point out how transition times were understood by Christian thinkers. A similar service was rendered by the *autor ad Hebraeos*, whose lofty idealism recalled many a straggler to the things that could not be shaken. Professor Galloway remarks, in his recent book on *Religion and Modern Thought*, that the current unsettlement which questions the old order, does not touch Christianity as a spiritual and vital religion but concerns certain ways in which it has been expressed and defined in doctrines. It is also a hopeful sign that "men are not disposed to explain away religious experience but rather to try to understand it" (p. 36f.).

One of the permanent values of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the plea for liberty of thought, that the church might express her convictions in keeping with the knowledge of the age. Since he was interested in construction there is nothing of the polemical in his writing. Just as the early church appropriated ideas to express her spiritual faith in terms of doctrine, as indeed has been done in every generation with fruitful results, so should this privilege and duty be conceded to the modern church. This unknown thinker of the first century was a student of literature and of human nature, influenced by the Platonic ideas of shadow and substance, and more of a humanist than a philosopher. His purpose was to point out that Christianity is the Absolute and Ultimate Religion, because it is the religion of attainment.

What led him to this conclusion? It was his conviction of the supreme worth of Jesus Christ. Whatever else was doubtful he was sure

of Jesus. In this certainty he was prepared for new experiments and for progressive combinations of thought that would enhance the sublime sufficiency of our Redeemer and Lord. Indeed, everything turns on Jesus, and he is aware that we could be assured of the versatility of Christianity only as we reckon with the full Personality of Christ. This has nothing to do with the Logos dogma of speculative abstraction, which was a later issue faced by the Fourth Gospel. He therefore hinges his entire argument on Jesus, and constantly urges his readers to fix their minds on him. In what moving terms of fragrant experience he refers to Jesus as High Priest (7. 26), Mediator (8. 6), Propitiation (2. 17), Surety of a better covenant (7. 22), Author and Perfecter of Faith (12. 2), Fore-runner (6. 20), the great Shepherd of the sheep (13. 20), the Ever-living Intercessor (7. 25). Scott's two chapters on "The High Priesthood of Christ" and "The Nature of Christ" show fine discernment.

The discussion of faith is one of the most impressive in all the New Testament. We miss the evangelical fervor of Paul and the mystical fellowship of John, but for our author's purpose nothing could be better. Faith is colored by the atmosphere of hope. Since his aim was to provide new motives, and to quicken the languid and indolent, exposed to the temptations of compromise and indifference, he takes high ground in referring to faith as "an active power which enables us to live victoriously in the strength of the unseen," as did the worthies of a former day, according to the magnificent eleventh chapter. Read Professor Scott's chapter on "Faith."

To be sure, there is much theology in this writing, but it is free from dogmatic assertiveness and hospitable to new light. At times it is difficult to follow the argument because of the allegorical interpretation. This is only to acknowledge that the author used the thought terms of his own day, as Professor Scott points out in the chapters on "Theological Affinities" and "The Religious Background." The same might be said of Paul's Rabbinic exegesis, and of Catholic and Protestant scholasticism. It could not be otherwise. The task of modern theology therefore is to distinguish between the kernel and the husk, as our leaders are increasingly acknowledging.

Another important question that engaged his attention is that of worship, which is the primary purpose of religion. The Christian life is a continual act of worship through the Great High Priest who gives us access to God. The doctrine of the two ages—the present and the future—which is reflected in apocalyptic thought, is displaced by the more convincing teaching of the two worlds—the material and the spiritual. "Christianity is conceived as the means whereby we can identify ourselves even now with the higher world, and so build ourselves on a true and lasting foundation" (p. 119). This thought is well brought out in the chapter on "The Two Ages of the Two Worlds." Refresh your memory by turning to the *READING COURSE* for January devoted to *Redemption from this World* by Professor Hogg. It is worth recalling with regard to the emphasis on worship that "this Epistle more perhaps than any other New Testament writing has moulded the lan-

guage of our prayers and hymns." It is significant that the most intellectual of the New Testament writers is also intensely devotional.

The Epistle was addressed to "men of education who were seeking in Christianity an answer to their intellectual doubts and problems." They were doubtless in the minority, but they represented an influence in excess of their numbers. Here then was a conscientious attempt to meet their perplexities. The finished style, balanced argument, and cultured tone were combined with ethical earnestness and spiritual insight. Instead of "intellectual frugality" there was the virility of a vigorous mind. It was no small service that this writer thus saved for Christianity many leaders of thought. They could not be neglected in that first century any more than now. Doctor Hutton rightly observes that Christian preachers and teachers ought to feel that they are failing in these days if they do not convince certain outstanding figures, who confess that life without some safeguard and relief Godward will grow sour, leading to bitterness. (Cf. *That the Ministry be not Blamed*, p. 191.) Bishop Gore declared that a serious danger threatens the church when her ministers "take refuge in social and practical interests from the difficulties of thought." Dr. Francis George Peabody stated with equal insistence, "If the Christian Church is to justify its leadership in the modern world, this must be, not merely through its reformatory spirit or philanthropic zeal, but through its clear and convincing thinking on the great themes of God and man" (*The Yale Review*, January, 1923, p. 331). Here, then, is the challenge to all preachers. Let us accept it with the courage of consecration and prove ourselves worthy stewards of the manifold grace of God.

SIDE READING

Those interested in the study of this Epistle should read Nairne's commentary in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*, a magnificent volume with a long introduction and lucid notes. Peake in *The New Century Bible* is also good. The essay in *The Pilgrim* by T. R. Glover is in the finest style.

Religion and Modern Thought. By GEORGE GALLOWAY (Scribners, \$2.50). Among the addresses which touch on our subject, your attention is directed to the chapters on "Theology, Its Task and Its Present Problems," "Some Aspects of the Present Religious Outlook," "Religious Experience and Theological Development," "Controversy—Its Meaning and Value," "The Question of the Essence of Christianity." In fact this book by a fertile thinker has not a dull page between its covers and will repay the most careful study.

For further information about books on subjects of interest to preachers, address this department, *Reading Course*, care of the METHODIST REVIEW, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

rch

in.

ng

a."

ice

to

nd

n-

a

or

in

es

ng

no

w

.)

en

ie

al

ie

it

n

a

h

e

s

e

y

e

.

n

.